

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

Vol. III, No. 1 ]

[ January, 1961

# पुराणम् PURĀṆA

[ Half-yearly Bulletin ]

VASANTA PANCHAMI NUMBER

पुराणं पञ्चमो वेद इति ब्रह्मानुशासनम् ।

यो न वेद पुराणं हि न स वेदात्र किञ्चन ॥

( स्कन्द पु० )

CHIEF EDITOR:

VASUDEVA S. AGRAWALA

PUBLISHER:

ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST  
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Subs.—Inland Rs. 12/-

Foreign :

## सम्पादक-मण्डल

पद्मभूषण पण्डितराज श्री राजेश्वरशान्ति द्वाविड :

अध्यक्ष, साङ्गवेद विद्यालय, रामवाट, वाराणसी ।

डा० वे० राघवन्, एम०, ए०, पी० एच० डी० :

अध्यक्ष, संस्कृत विभाग, मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय, मद्रास ।

डा० वासुदेवशरण अग्रवाल, एम० ए०, डी० लिट् :

अध्यक्ष, कला तथा वास्तु विभाग, इंडोलोजी कालेज,

काशी हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी । ( प्रधान सम्पादक )

श्री आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त एम० ए०, शास्त्री :

पुराण-विभाग, सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यास । ( सहायक सम्पादक )

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Padma-Bhūṣhaṇa Paṇḍita-rāja Śrī Rajeśvara Śaṅti  
Dvāṭḍa ; Principal, Sāṅga-Veda-Vidyālaya, Varanasi.

Dr. V. Raghavan, M. A., Ph. D. ; Professor and Head of  
Sanskrit Dept., Madras University, Madras.

Dr. Vāsudeva S. Agrawala, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt. ;  
Professor and Head of the Dept. of Art and Architec-  
ture, Banaras Hindu University. (Editor-in-Chief)

Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, M. A., Shastri ; Pūrāṇa Dept.,  
All-India Kashiraj Trust. (Assistant Editor)

लेखकमहोदयैः प्रकटीकृता विचारस्तेषामेव स्वायत्ता ,  
न पुनस्ते 'पुराण' पत्रिकां निबध्नन्ति ।

Authors are responsible for their views,  
which do not bind the Editors.

## CONTENTS.

VASANTA PANCHAMĪ NUMBER

Vol. III]

[Jan. 21, 1961]

[No 1

Pages

याज्ञवल्क्यकृत-सरस्वती-स्तवनम्

( ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणम् , प्रकृतिखण्डम् , अ० ५, श्लो० १-३२ )

1—3

Western Indology and the Purāṇa

4—7

*Dr. Juan Roger Rivière,*

Professor of Indology, Serrano 117—Madrid

Some Significant Allegories in the Purāṇas

8—21

*Dr. A. D. Pusalker,* Director of Research Dept.,

Bhandarker Oriental Research Institute, Poona

व्यास-महिमा (Compiled by *Shri R. S. Bhattacharya*)

22

Political Thought and Practice in the Agni-Purāṇa

23—37

*Dr. Dasharath Sharma,* M. A., D. Litt.

Professor, Delhi University, Delhi.

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa : Edition and Translations.

38—45

*Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti,* M. A.

28/3 B, Sahasr Nagar Road, Kalighat, Calcutta—6.

पुराण-महत्त्वम्

46

(Compiled by *Shri Anand Swarup Gupta*)

The Characteristic Feature of the Uttarkhaṇḍa of  
the Padma Purāṇa

97—60

*Prof. Asoke Chatterji ;* Shastri, M. A. ;

Govt. Taki College, Taki, West Bengal.

पुराणसुभाषितानि ( हरिवंशपुराणात् )

61—63

(Compiled by *Dr. Bina Pani Pande,*

2, Raibeharilal Road, Lucknow)

Rāmaṇīyakam—The Island of the Nāgas

64—71

*Prof. Sadashiv A. Dange.* M. A. ;

Deshmukh Plots, Khamgaon (Maharashtra)

पुराणसंशोधने भारतीयराजनीतेः सम्यगालोचनमावश्यकम् पद्मभूषण पं० राजेश्वरशास्त्री इविह, अध्यक्ष सांगवेद विद्यालय, रामघाट, काशी	72—91
The Apocryphal Character of the Extant Brahma- vaivarta Purāṇa <i>Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, M. A. ;</i> Purāṇa Dept., All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi	92—101
प्रह्लादचरित-समालोचनम् महामहोपाध्याय श्री पं० अनन्तकृष्ण शास्त्री, हनुमानघाट, काशी	102—114
Home of the Matsya Purāṇa <i>Dr. S. G. Kantawala, M. A., Ph. D.,</i> Lecturer in Sanskrit, M. S. University, Baroda	115—119
The Metrical Analysis of the Matsya Purāṇa (Continued from Vol. II.) <i>Prof. C. R. Swaminathan, M.A., M. Litt.,</i> Govt. Arts College, Madras	120—133
A Review of the work of the Purāṇa-Deptt. of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. <i>Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, M. A.,</i> Asstt. Editor, Purāṇa-Deptt., A.I. Kashiraj Trust	134—140
पुराण-विषयसूची (Purāṇic Concordance) <i>Shri Ramshankar Bhattacharya, M. A.,</i> Vyākaraṇāchārya ; All-India Kashiraj Trust	141—182
Veda Vyāsa Institute of Purāṇa and Indological Research <i>Shri Ram-shohandra De,</i> General Secretary, All-India Kashiraj Trust	183
Book-Review <i>J. Duncan M. Derrett, London</i>	184-188



## याज्ञवल्क्यकृत-सरस्वतीस्तवनम्

( ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणम् , प्रकृतिखण्डम् , अ० ५, श्लो० ६-३२ )

कृपां कुरु जगन्मातर्ममिव हततेजसम् ।

गुरुशापात्स्मृतिभ्रष्टं विद्याहीनं च दुःखितम् ॥ ६ ॥

ज्ञानं देहि स्मृतिं देहि विद्यां विद्याधिदेवते ।

प्रतिष्ठां कवितां देहि शक्तिं शिष्यप्रबोधिकाम् ॥ ७ ॥

ग्रन्थनिर्मितिशक्तिं च सच्छिष्यं सुप्रतिष्ठितम् ।

प्रतिभां सत्सभायां च विचारक्षमतां शुभाम् ॥ ८ ॥

लुप्तां सर्वा दैववशान्नवं कुरु पुनः पुनः ।

यथाऽङ्कुरं जनयति भगवान् योगमायया ॥ ९ ॥

ब्रह्मस्वरूपा परमा ज्योतीरूपा सनातनी ।

सर्वविद्याधिदेवी या तस्यै वाण्यै नमो नमः ॥ १० ॥

यया विना जगत्सर्वं शश्वज्जीवन्मृतं सदा ।

ज्ञानाधिदेवी या तस्यै सरस्वत्यै नमो नमः ॥ ११ ॥

यया विना जगत्सर्वं मूकमुन्मत्तवत्सदा ।

वागधिष्ठातृदेवी या तस्यै वाण्यै नमो नमः ॥ १२ ॥

हिमचन्दनकुन्देन्दुकुमुदाम्भोजसन्निभा ।

वर्णाधिदेवी या तस्यै चाक्षरायै नमो नमः ॥ १३ ॥

विसर्गबिन्दुमात्राणां यदधिष्ठानमेव च ।

इत्थं त्वं गीयसे सद्भिर्भारत्यै ते नमो नमः ॥ १४ ॥

यया विनाऽत्र संख्याकृत् संख्यां कर्तुं न शक्नुते ।

कालसंख्यास्वरूपा या तस्यै देव्यै नमो नमः ॥ १५ ॥

व्याख्यास्वरूपा या देवि व्याख्याधिष्ठानदेवता ।

अमसिद्धान्तरूपा या तस्यै देव्यै नमो नमः ॥ १६ ॥

स्मृतिशक्तिर्ज्ञानशक्तिर्बुद्धिशक्तिस्वरूपिणी ।

प्रतिभा-कल्पना-शक्तिर्या च तस्यै नमोनमः ॥ १७ ॥

सनत्कुमारो ब्रह्माणं ज्ञानं पप्रच्छ यत्र वै ।

बभूव जडवत्सोऽपि सिद्धान्तं कर्तुं मक्षमः ॥ १८ ॥

तदाऽऽजगाम भगवानात्मा श्रीकृष्ण ईश्वरः ।

उवाच स च तं स्तौहि वाणीमिति प्रजापते ॥ १९ ॥

स च तुष्टाव तां ब्रह्मा चाज्ञया परमात्मनः ।

चकार तत्प्रसादेन तदा सिद्धान्तमुत्तमम् ॥ २० ॥

यदाप्यनन्तं पप्रच्छ ज्ञानमेकं वसुंधरा ।

बभूव मूकवत्सोपि सिद्धान्तं कर्तुं मक्षमः ॥ २१ ॥

तदा त्वां च स तुष्टाव संतस्तः कश्यपाज्ञया ।

तत्तश्चकार सिद्धान्तं निर्मलं अममञ्जनम् ॥ २२ ॥

व्यासः पुराणसूत्रं समष्टुच्छद् वाल्मीकिं यदा ।

मौनीभूतः स सस्मार त्वामेव जगदम्बिकाम् ॥ २३ ॥

तदा चकार सिद्धान्तं त्वद्वारेण मुनीश्वरः ।

स प्राप निर्मलं ज्ञानं प्रमादध्वंसकारणम् ॥ २४ ॥

पुराणसूत्रं श्रुत्वा स व्यासः कृष्णकलोद्भवः ।

त्वां सिन्धवे च दध्यौ च शतवर्षं च पुष्करे ॥ २५ ॥

तदा त्वत्तो वरं प्राप्य स कवीन्द्रो बभूव ह ।

तदा वेदविभागं च पुराणानि चकार ह ॥ २६ ॥

यदा महेन्द्रे पप्रच्छ तत्त्वज्ञानं शिवा शिवम् ।

क्षणं त्वामेव संचिन्त्य तस्यै ज्ञानं ददौ विभुः ॥ २७ ॥

पप्रच्छ शब्दशास्त्रं च महेन्द्रश्च बृहस्पतिम् ।

दिव्यं वर्षसहस्रं च स त्वा दध्यौ च पुष्करे ॥ २८ ॥

तदा त्वत्तो वरं प्राप्य दिव्यं वर्षसहस्रकम् ।

उवाच शब्दशास्त्रं च तदर्थं च सुरेश्वरम् ॥ २९ ॥

अध्यापिताश्च यैः शिष्या यैरधीतं मुनीश्वरैः ।

ते च त्वां परिसंचिन्त्य प्रवर्तन्ते सुरेश्वरि ॥ ३० ॥

त्वं संस्तुता पूजिता च मुनीन्द्रमनुमानवैः ।

दैत्येन्द्रैश्च सुरैश्चापि ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवादिभिः ॥ ३१ ॥

जडीभूतः सहस्रास्यः पञ्चवक्त्रश्चतुर्मुखः ।

यां स्तोतुं किमहं स्तौमि तामेकास्येन मानवः ॥ ३२ ॥

# WESTERN INDOLOGY AND THE PURĀṆA

By

JUAN ROGER RIVIÈRE

[ अस्मिन् निबन्धे स्पेनदेशीयेन विदुषा लेखकेन भारतीयविद्याऽध्येतॄणां पाश्चात्यविदुषां पुराणविषयकाः केचिद्विचाराः प्रस्तावाश्चोपन्यस्ताः । सम्प्रति पाश्चात्यविद्वांसः पुराणवाङ्मयमतीव महत्त्वपूर्णमुपयोगि च मन्यन्ते । पृथिव्यां केवला काशीनगर्येव तत्स्थानं यत्र प्राचीनभारतीयशास्त्राणामध्ययनं सुकरं, पाश्चात्यविद्वद्भिश्चात्रागत्य अव्रत्यानां विदुषां सकाशात् शास्त्राण्यध्येतव्यानि चेति लेखकस्य मतम् । आधुनिककाले पाश्चात्यदेशेषु पौराणिकानामाख्यानानां मनोविज्ञानसाहाय्येन फ्रायड्-एडलर-युंगादीनां मनोविज्ञानविदुषामनुयायिभिर्बुधैर्मनोवैज्ञानिकमध्ययनमारब्धम् ।

विदुषा लेखकेन पुराणानां वैज्ञानिकाध्ययनस्य सम्यक्प्रसाराय केचिदतीवोपयोगिनः प्रस्तावा अप्यत्रोपन्यस्ताः, तद्यथा—१. वैज्ञानिकपद्धतिमाश्रित्य पुराणानां समीक्षात्मकानि भाषान्तराणि सम्पाद्यानि, २. महापुराणानामुपपुराणानां च प्राचीनहस्तलिखितकोशानां साहाय्येन आधुनिकपाठशोधनप्रणत्या प्रामाणिकानि संस्करणानि प्रकाशयानि, इमं कार्यभारं तु काशिराजन्यासो वोढुमर्हतीति लेखकस्य प्रस्तावः, ३. काप्येका मूलपुराणसंहिताऽऽसीदथवा विभिन्नसम्प्रदायानां पृथक् पृथक् संहिताऽऽसीदिति गवेषणीयं, ४. पुराणपरम्पराया विकासे सूतस्य यत्प्रभाव आसीत्, बहुषु पुराणेषु सूतस्य कथयितृत्वेनानुमीयमानं पुराणानां पूर्वं संवादात्मकमन्यद्वा यत्स्वरूपमासीत् तदसुसंभ्रातव्यं, ५. पुराणविषयाणां तुलनात्मकमध्ययनं कर्तव्यं, ६. अध्यायस्कन्धादिक्रमेण पुराणानां विश्लेषणात्मकमध्ययनमप्यावश्यकम्, ७. पुराणानि खलु वेदार्थोपबृंहकाणि प्राधान्येन, अतस्तेषां न केवलमैतिहासिकः आधिभौतिको वाऽर्थ एव ग्राह्यः, अपि तु तेषां लक्षणिको प्रतीकात्मको वा आधिदैविकः आध्यात्मिकश्चार्थोऽपि गवेषणीयः, ८. तन्त्रशास्त्रमतीवोपयोगि सर्वविद्यागारं च, तस्मिन् तन्त्रशास्त्रे परमरहस्यमयी विशा उच्चसाधना च वर्तते, अतः पुराणतन्त्रशास्त्रयोस्तुलनात्मकमध्ययनमपि कर्तव्यमिति । ]

First of all I have to apologize for writing about *Purāṇa* in this review as it may seem presumptuous to present an essay on this subject done by an occidental Indologist in a highly specialized Review published in Banaras, the very holy and sacred city of India. There is no other place in the world, in my opinion,

where there are more possibilities to study the sacred text of the religious *Śāstras* of the Hindus and I think that every occidental searcher into the Indian Tradition, has to study first the teaching of the pandits of the holy Kāśī, to understand the deep sense of the Scriptures.

For these reasons, I do not intend to write an "original" study on *Purāṇa*. My aim will be only to present here how Western Indology considers the value and study of *Purāṇa* and to precise which are the points that need, in my opinion, to be studied and investigated by our Indian colleagues who may be considered as the first and the best specialists on this matter.

I think that there is not any occidental University chair where students can hear now that *Purāṇa* is "a collection of non-sense stories" and "old stupidities" full of "religious superstitions". Fortunately this time is over, and there is more respect for religious traditions and, above all, more scientific doubts on the unknown matter in the wide field of Indology. Western scientific people are now used to deal with religious, linguistic and traditional problems; the study of the great myths has been renewed by the psychological schools of Freud, Adler and above all that of Jung. On my part, I say to my students that we have to see, behind strange forms and old conceits, the eternal archetypes of Humanity, and that they have at least to be always very respectful before unknown religious forms and traditional scriptures.

For us, Western Indologists, *Purāṇas* are a series of very hard and serious problems. First of all, there are few translations (I mean critical and good translations in English), and I think that one of the most urgent tasks of your Society would be the critical edition of the great Puranic texts (*Mahāpurāṇa* and *Upapurāṇa*), I know it is a work quite difficult and I suggest that it could begin with a good and nearly complete resume of the texts, a kind of analytical study of the *Purāṇa*, giving a concise but very clear exposition of the *adhyāya* and *skandha*; I know that the resume of the *Pādma Pur*, for example, with

its 600 *adhyāyas*, would mean an enormous work, but I think it is indispensable to do it sooner or later.

Just, to carry out this work, we also need to prepare some systematic studies of the contents of the *Purāṇa* to analyze afterwards the great conceits inclosed in them: Cosmology, Creation of the Universe, traditions on the *avatāra*, problem of death and post-mortem life (especially in the *Gāruḍa Purāṇa*, in its *uttarakhanda*), evolution of the *bhakti*, details on the cult etc. It could begin by the study of the *pañchalakṣhaṇa*, in a systematic way, of each *Purāṇa*, for example. We know that the purpose of *Purāṇa* is to develop and unfold the secret sense of *Veda*. The official western teaching of Indology has given, till the present times, a very materialistic signification to the *Veda* teaching. I am sure that the puranic interpretations and commentaries would bring to the west, new lights on this matter.

The occidental science accepts only the material sense of these texts and depreciates the allegorical, moral, psychological, religious and spiritual interpretations that Indian Tradition keeps and maintains in its holy scriptures. The knowledge of the puranic interpretations of the Holy *Śruti* will be very useful for the sincere western investigators in Indology.

The question of a primitive *Purāṇasamhitā* is very interesting; it is said that it was divided into four *mūlasamhitās* or six *Āmaharṣaṇika samhitās*. This problem is essential for the study of the origins of the actual puranic texts; about this point there are several western theories; some of them think about an original and single text of which the *Brahma Pur*, the *Śiva Pur*, the *Āgni Pur*, with the *Harivaṃśa* could show the most approximated form. Others speak of separate works of different schools and of an oral tradition former to the written transcription of this tradition. It would be very interesting to study part of the *Sāte* in this transmission. In many *Purāṇas*, we see the squire *Lomaśaṛṣaṇa* or his son, the *Sauti Ugraśrawas*, who acts as narrator; this may indicate perhaps that at first they were dialogues which were systematized later. Which is the impor-

tance of the *Kṣatriya* element in the elaboration of the *Purāṇa* ? The dialogues held in the Naimiśas forest may show a royal viz. *kṣatriya* participation in this elaboration.

For my part, I was always very interested in the tantric side of Hinduism ; I use, of course, the word "Tantra" in the sense of a *śāstra* following the *Purāṇa* ; as the *Kulārṇava Tantra* says, if *Purāṇa* was given for the *Dvāpara yuga*, the *Tantra* belongs to the *Kali yuga*. We know the encyclopedic character of the Tantras ; they are not only the basis of popular Hindu practices, but the depository of esoteric believes and practices. We find in these holy Scriptures a description of the Supreme Being, the creation and destruction of the universe, classification of creatures, the origin and worship of Gods, different worlds and hells, psychology of the human body, various forms of spiritual training, medicine, science, etc.

The question is now to find which are the connections between *Purāṇa* and *Tantra*. I do not know any comparative study on this matter and I think it would be very useful, for the western Indology, to have good material on this matter.

I fear that this article will defraud the readers of this Review ; it consists only of a series of questions and problems on the *Purāṇa* and nothing else. Notwithstanding, I consider that is all a western Indologist can do on this matter when he writes in a specialized Review of India ; he has to ask to his Hindu colleagues, who know better than any occidental searcher, the texts and commentaries of the *śāstras*, to prepare the material for future theories and synthesis that could be useful for the teaching of Indology in Western Universities.

# SOME SIGNIFICANT ALLEGORIES IN THE PURĀNAS

By

A. D. PUSALKER

[ अस्मिन् निबन्धे बा० पुसात्करमहोदयः केषांचित् पौराणिकाख्यानानां रूपकात्मकतां प्रतिपादयति । पुराणानि खलु सामान्यजनोपयोगाय सुबोधशील्यां रोचकाख्यानमुखेन धर्मस्य दर्शनस्य विज्ञानस्य च गहनतत्त्वानि विशदीकुर्वन्ति । एतदर्थं च रूपकाणां प्रतीकानां बोधयोगः कियते । सूक्ष्मबुद्धिप्राज्ञाणि वैदिकतत्त्वानि शास्त्राः सृष्टिनियमाश्च पुराणैः प्रायो रूपकरीत्या विव्रियन्ते । ज्ञानविज्ञानयोर्गहनतत्त्वान्यपि रूपकात्मकेष्वख्यानेष्ववतीर्य हिमवच्छिखरादवतीर्णगङ्गाप्रवाहवद् लोकेष्वविरतं प्रचरन्ति अनश्वरतां च लभन्ते । पौराणिकाख्यानानां स्थूलबुद्धिप्राज्ञे बुद्ध्यर्थेनवासस्य तत्र निगूढानि ज्ञानविज्ञानतत्त्वान्यपि सूक्ष्ममतिमिर्मनी-निमिरन्विगन्तव्यानीति लेखकस्याजुरोचः । श्रीशंकराचार्यैर्मोहमुद्राराक्षये ग्रन्थे रामायणकथाया आध्यात्मिकोऽर्थः व्याख्यातः, तथा तन्त्रवार्तिके श्री कुमारिलभट्टरिणः कानिचिन्महाभारताख्यानानि रूपकत्वेन व्याख्यातानि । एवमधुनापि सहस्रपादिस्थादिनो विराट्स्वरूपस्य तथा विराट्पुरुषस्य मुख्याद्यज्ञेभ्यो ब्राह्मणादि-वर्णानामुत्पत्तेश्च लक्ष्यार्थ एव गृह्यते न त्वमिषेयः ।

पौराणिकरूपकाणामत्र विभागचतुष्टयं कृत्वा विवृष्या लेखकेन केषाञ्चित्पौराणिकाख्यानानां रूपकाणि विवृतानि; ते च विभागा यथा—१. सृष्टिविषयाः, २. विराट्पुरुषाद् ब्राह्मणादिवर्णोत्पत्तिः, ३. रामायणमहाभारतोः कथाः, ४. कर्तव्यार्थार्जुन-परशुरामयोश्च युद्धकथा ।

तत्र प्रथमे विभागे व्याख्यातानि—(क) राजावतरणं ( यत्र शिवजटासु गङ्गाया अवस्थानं कैलाशपर्वतीये गहने तस्या लोप इति व्याख्यातम् ); (ख) कुन्दाश्वत्थ पुन्नुनाम्नाऽसुरेण सह युद्धं ( पुन्नुनामाऽसुरो राजस्थानप्रदेशस्य दक्षिणभागेऽवस्थितस्य समुद्रस्य समीपेऽवस्थितः कबिद् ज्वालोज्ज्वारी गर्तः, कुन्दाश्वत्थेन पुन्नुवधश्च = तेन तस्य गर्तस्य समुद्रवारिणा पूरणं ज्वालानिर्वापणं च ); तथा (ग) कश्यपपुत्रा निर्वसितस्य परशुरामस्य समुद्राद् भूमियाचर्न, सर्वनावा वसतीक्षरे च समुद्रस्य परशुप्रहारेण दण्डनं समुद्रेण च तस्मै कैलाशकवच भूतान्तस्य प्रदायम् ।

द्वितीये विभागे विराजो मुखवाङ्मुखादेभ्यो ब्राह्मणादिवर्णानामुत्पत्तिर्वाच्यता । तृतीये विभागे रामायणकथायाः महाभारताख्यानस्य च केषांचित् रूपकात्मकैरुक्तं मतानुसारेण रूपकत्वं प्रदर्शितम्, तद्विदर्शनं यथा—‘लुब्धविग’



नाम्नो विदुषो मत्तानुसारेण पञ्च पाण्डुपुत्राः पञ्च ऋतव एव, ये पृथ्वी ( कृष्णा, द्रौपदीरूपा ) क्रमेणाध्यासते, भारतयुद्धं च नैशं तमोऽपसारयितुं सहस्ररश्मेर्यम इति । चतुर्थविभागे कार्तवीर्यार्जुनस्य परशुरामेण सह विग्रहो व्याख्यातः । अयं विग्रहस्तु यस्तुतो हैहयक्षत्रियाणां समुद्रमार्गेण विदेहिब्यापारं कुर्वद्भिर्भार्गव-ब्राह्मणैः सह स्पृघामूलक एव; कार्तवीर्यस्य सहस्रं युद्धपोताश्च तस्य बाहुसहस्र-मिति प्रसिद्धिममजन् । ]

The Purāṇas constitute important sources for the political and cultural history of India, embodying as they do particulars about every aspect of life—religious, philosophical, social, political and personal. They were meant especially for the women and the Śūdras and represented the Veda for the laity. As the Purāṇas were intended to cater to the needs of the common man, it was the endeavour of the writers of the Purāṇas to present the material in a way that would appeal to him and would be appreciated and understood by him. It is to be observed in this connection that the aims and ideals of the writers of the Purāṇas and the ways and means employed by them to achieve these objectives were quite distinct from those of the modern historians and writers of cultural treatises. All great events that added to the cultural content of India figure in the Purāṇas, and the main aim of the writers of the Purāṇas was to preserve for posterity the important contributions of eminent personages, to perpetuate the principles propounded by illustrious thinkers and to present the entire material so as to appear ever fresh to the readers so that they may constantly place those ideals before them. Allegory was the device frequently resorted to by the Purāṇas in order to make a popular appeal and to preserve the tradition.

Derived from the terminology of Greek rhetoric, allegory, which “means primarily a series of metaphors” and is “used also in explaining a work of literature”, has a rather narrow range.<sup>1</sup> In its wider sense allegory represents the meaning put by the reader on a piece of writing which he finds to be more or less in need of interpretation. Such an interpretation is justified only in those cases where the author had a secret meaning in

mind. Allegorical interpretation, further, represents a subjective conception which is relative and not absolute and which has nothing to do with the actual truth. It may be noted that the tendency to allegorise arises from the natural desire to perpetuate some idea or truth which has come to be regarded as sacred. There are, again, several stories or episodes in ancient literature which are absurd if taken literally. It would certainly be unwise to reject the entire story on account of such apparent absurdities, but one should try to look deeper beyond the literal meaning to extract the wisdom of the ancients. The explanations offered by Kumārila in his *Tantravārtika*<sup>1</sup> about some episodes like the polyandrous marriage of the Pāṇḍavas, Indra's adultery with Ahalyā, etc. illustrate this aspect of the point.

Allegory is said to be the child of an epoch more reflective than the one which produced mythology. Even today it is active because there is the need of reading a new meaning into the sacred tradition in order to protect it from the satire of its critics. The conception of Viṣṇupuruṣa is explained now in terms of social solidarity, and Nārāyaṇa-sevā as humanitarianism. The gods and goddesses having three, four, five heads, and four, eight, sixteen hands are interpreted to be divine, immensely more powerful than man with the usual number. Gods never wink their eyes, their feet never touch the earth to distinguish them from human beings. Though gods and goddesses have many heads and hands, Viṣṇu alone has a thousand legs (*śaṣaṣra-pād*)—evidently the aggregate of all living beings. None feels a monstrosity in the gods having unusual number of heads and hands; Viṣṇu's constant or four months' sleep is only Yoga; but a Kumbhakārṇa's sleep, Baka's gluttony,—are all monstrosities with a moral aim even as miraculous legends.

In order to find out allegorical meaning we have to dive deep and go beyond the surface meaning. "All great works of Indian art and literature", as aptly put by the late Dr. Sukthankar, "...are...infused with the idea of penetrating behind the phenomena to the core of things, and they represent

but so many pulsating reflexes of one and the same central impulse towards seeing unity in diversity, towards achieving one gigantic all-embracing synthesis."<sup>8</sup> They have thus an inner and deeper meaning, and the Purāṇas are no exception. We shall deal with the allegories in the Purāṇas under four broad headings : (i) natural phenomena ; (ii) origin of the castes ; (iii) stories of the epics ; and (iv) Kārtavīrya Arjuna and Paraśurāma.

(i) Natural phenomena : We begin the allegories connected with natural phenomena with reference to the story of the descent of the Gaṅgā which is too well known to need any recapitulation here. Bhagīratha of the solar dynasty is said to have brought down the Gaṅgā from the Himālayas through his penance and had to propitiate Śiva. The story seems to refer to directing the course of the Gaṅgā from the Himālayas to the eastern regions to water and fertilise the tract. It involved the efforts of four generations of the rulers of the Ayodhyā dynasty, viz. Sagara, Amśumān, Dilīpa and Bhagīratha. The penance of Bhagīratha at Gokarna in the Himālayas represents his efforts to turn the flow of the stream or glacier in the Himālayas in a particular direction through the valleys. Of the seven streams Bhagīratha guided one eastwards. In order to chasten the proud and elated Gaṅgā Lord Śiva is said to have completely held her in his matted locks. This indicates the disappearance of the stream in the dense forests of the Mt. Kailāsa region which could not be traced. Bhagīratha's further penance and propitiation of Śiva represents his thorough search through the thick forests and then finally the blocking of the outlet to the valleys which led to the disappearance of the stream, resulted in the flow of the stream in the desired direction. In the further progress of the Gaṅgā through the plains after she had negotiated the Himālayas, king Jahnu is said to have drunk the river as it overflowed his āśrama and submerged his sacrificial maṇḍapa. This indicates the diversion of the stream in another direction ; and this was stopped after Bhagīratha pacified Jahnu and the stream began to flow through the channel prepared by Bhagīratha who carried the stream up to the eastern sea. This magnificent

achievement of Bhagīratha represents one of the greatest irrigation works in the world more than a thousand miles in length.

As king Bṛihadaśva, father of Kuvalāśva of the solar dynasty, who ruled about twenty-two generations prior to the famous Kārtavīrya Arjuna<sup>4</sup> (to whom reference has been made later in this article), according to traditional history, prepared to go to forest after crowning his son, Uttāṅka, who resided in Marubhūmi in the Rajputana desert, requested him not to resort to *tapovana* without first accounting for the monster Dhundhu. Bṛihadaśva assigned the task of killing Dhundhu to his son, Kuvalāśva, who later came to be known as Dhudhumāra after his achieving this feat. Kuvalāśva is said to have destroyed the subterranean quarters of the Asura and put an end to his fiery home. The description in the *Harivaṃśa* (I. 11) shows that near Uttāṅka's hermitage there was a sandy sea in the marshy land, and the monster Dhundhu at the interval of each year showered fire and dust all round. Kuvalāśva first cleared the land of its marsh by digging deep ditches near the sea, and then dug the sandy sea in order to locate the monster which was nothing else but a volcanic pit towards the west. The prince extinguished the pit by the flow of subterranean water.<sup>5</sup> The story suggests, according to Pargiter, "that the southern part of the Rajputana desert was still a very sandy sea",<sup>6</sup> and it was gradually retreating. This was the famous sea towards the south of the Rajputana desert in the Vedic period, into which flowed the Vedic river Sarasvatī. This legend also indicates that Kuvalāśva vanquished the Asuras and the aborigines in the western and southern regions of Rajputana and spread the Aryan culture in these lands.

The third natural phenomenon that we are dealing with concerns the emergence of the Konkan (and Kerala) out of the sea on account of the arrow shot by Paraśurāma, and its subsequent colonisation by the Bhārgava hero. After donating the whole earth to sage Kaśyapa as sacrificial fee at the sacrifice performed to atone for the sin resulting from the slaughter of

innumerable Kshatriyas, Paraśurāma was banished by Kaśyapa from the earth, and consequently was left with no footing on the earth. In order to have some land for himself he demanded it of the sea which the latter ignored. Enraged at this insult, Paraśurāma shot an arrow (or his famous axe) at the ocean, and it retreated exposing the land up to the point covered by the arrow (or axe). The land thus recovered extended from the Sahya mountains to the sea, covering the entire west coast. Later on, Paraśurāma colonised the land by bringing Brāhmaṇas, either from the north or other parts of India or from outside, or by reviving dead corpses. This story, no doubt, shows that Paraśurāma was the first coloniser of the tract between the western ghats and the sea, but it also refers to the natural phenomenon of the land coming out of the sea due to some seismic disturbances. So far as Kerala is concerned, where also the Paraśurāma tradition persists, it has been shown, from geological evidence, "that there was first a raising of the Kerala coast as represented by the eastern border of our present backwater tract. ...after the coast line became thus defined, the backwater was formed with a new coast line farther to the west of the ancient shore line. The one or the other of these phenomena may be described as a reclamation of Kerala from the sea."<sup>7</sup> In common with the legends all over the world associating heroes with natural phenomena, Paraśurāma came to be credited with this achievement.

(ii) Origin of the castes: The origin of the castes through the different limbs of the Puruṣa, as mentioned in Puruṣa-sūkta,<sup>8</sup> has been repeated in several Purāṇas. This has been allegorically interpreted as implying a scheme of social stratification based on the principle of the division of labour.<sup>9</sup> Thus, the Brāhmaṇas, created from the mouth, the seat of speech, enact the part of preceptors of humanity, while the Kshatriyas, produced from arms, the symbol of valour and strength, are entrusted with the protection of people through "arms". Born through thighs, the Vaiśyas provide food to the people, and the Śūdras, coming from feet, are servants

(footmen) of the three higher varṇas. Thus the whole social organisation is symbolically represented as one cosmic being with its different limbs playing the rôles of the different classes of social order.

(iii) Stories of the epics: As the stories of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* form the subject-matter of the Purāṇas and also because the *Mahābhārata* styles itself a Purāṇa, we may as well consider the allegorical significance of these. There is no doubt that they convey deeper meanings beyond what is apparent or the surface meaning. To turn to the *Mahābhārata* first: In the huge forest of different interpretations of the epic story, in their enthusiasm to unravel the mystery of the *Mahābhārata* and discover its hidden meaning most of the scholars miss the plain meaning—that the *Mahābhārata* is a history (*itiḥāsa*), as it claims to be, of the Kuru princes, of their dissensions, loss of kingdom and victory.<sup>10</sup> Reference can be made here only to a few important interpretations of the story of the *Mahābhārata*.

According to Joseph Dahlmann, the *Mahābhārata*, which “was composed with the avowed and exclusive object of expounding all the different aspects of Hindu Law, in the widest sense of the term, not omitting even its historical and archaic features and oddities”,<sup>11</sup> welded together the pre-existing narrative and didactic elements artificially with a view to popularising Dharmaśāstra among the masses. The Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas represent personifications of Dharma and Adharma and there is no authenticity for the feud between them. Ludwig, however, on the basis of a nature-myth, took the *Mahābhārata* to be the seasonal myth in which the Pāṇḍavs symbolised the seasons with Draupadī, their common spouse, as the dark earth (kṛishṇā) possessed alternately by the five seasons. The Bhārata war represented the struggle between the sun and the darkness of night. A similar interpretation is also put by Lachmi Dhar,<sup>12</sup> who points out the solar character of the Pāṇḍavas, while the Kauravas are said to be princes of darkness. The marriage of Draupadī was but the epic version of the Vedic solar myth

of the marriage of Ushas with the sun, while the Bhārata war represents the slaying of the dragon of darkness and the triumph of Ushas. The *vastraharṣa* episode here means that the forces of darkness try to snatch away dawn by pulling her morning tresses from her solar husband. Lassen took the *dramatis personae* of the epic to be not ordinary human beings but rather historical conditions or circumstances. Pāṇḍu (lit. white), thus, was originally the name of royal family of the "white" race which had migrated to India from the north and which was later known as Arjuna (lit. white).<sup>13</sup> There is also a view that the Bhārata war represents but the struggle for the victory of the principle of Aryan-Dravidian synthesis over orthodox Aryanism, the Pāṇḍavas standing for the former, and the Kauravas for the latter, principle. Thadani takes the *Mahābhārata* as the symbolisation of the six systems of Hindu philosophy which meet in the region of mind.<sup>14</sup> According to him, the whole story of the *Mahābhārata* is "but an account of the connection and conflict between the different systems of Hindu Philosophy and religion." Further, "...the...conflict...between principal Vedānta and principal Sāṅkhya, or Vaiṣṇavism on the one hand and Buddhism and Jainism on the other,...is the subject-matter of the great 'battle' of Kurukshetra." He presses into service the "ancient method of Letter-analysis" to solve the mystery of the *Mahābhārata* and to reveal its real meaning. Robert Shafer opens his *Ethnography of India* with the sentence: "The Great Epic of India is essentially the story of native rebellion against Aryan exploitation."<sup>15</sup>

According to Dr. Sukthankar, whose posthumous publication, *On the Meaning of the Mahābhārata*, recently published, represents the essence of his life-long study of the *Mahābhārata*, the historical interpretation (i. e., the realistic account of the fratricidal war) is but the meaning of the *Mahābhārata* on the mundane plane. He dives deep into the *Mahābhārata* and carries us to ethical and metaphysical planes, where the *Mahābhārata* story assumes quite an important significance. The ethical plane views the Bhārata war as a conflict between the principles

of Dharma and Adharma, between good and evil, between justice and injustice, in which the contending parties are regarded as incarnations of Devas and Asuras, and the war ends in the victory of Dharma. The projection of the story on to a cosmic background shows the Bhārata war "as a mere phase in cosmic evolution."<sup>16</sup> Here, Śrī Kṛishṇa is the avatāra or incarnation of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa, while Arjuna is that of Indra. On the ethico-psychological plane, "the epic aims at impressing upon the reader or rather the listener the paramountacy of moral values."<sup>17</sup> On the transcendental or metaphysical plane, however, which carries us beyond Dharma and Adharma, the war is fought not only in Kurukshetra, but also in our mind, between the higher self and the lower self of man, symbolised by the family of cousins fighting for the sovereignty of the kingdom over the body. Here we are face to face with the deep mysteries of life. The super-man (Arjuna) under the guidance of the Super-Self (Śrī Kṛishṇa) emerges successful, in this conflict, after destroying his ignorance embodied in his illegitimate desires and passions etc., by the sword of knowledge. In this interpretation, Śrī Kṛishṇa is the Paramātman (Super-Self) while Arjuna is the Jīvātman (individual self). Though the symbolism is not applicable in all particulars, nor is there the harmonisation of all the doctrines of the epic both in ethics and philosophy, there is no doubt that this metaphysical interpretation leads us to the deeper meaning of the *Mahābhārata*.

The case of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is similar to that of the *Mahābhārata*. Most of the scholars accept the historical basis for the *Rāmāyaṇa* that it represents the adventures of the prince of Ayodhyā though the marvellous and the miraculous have been mixed up with the nucleus to a large extent. Though Jacobi takes the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the blending of two distinct elements, history and allegory, viz. (i) palace intrigue and banishment, and (ii) the abduction of Sītā and the killing of Rāvaṇa, it is evident that the entire *Rāmāyaṇa* is a complete unit. The *Rāmāyaṇa* has been taken as representing the civilisation of the south.



To refer to some of the allegorical interpretations, we find that though Lassen takes it as an allegorical representation of the Aryan conquest of the south, he accepts Dāśarathi Rāma as a historical personage, transported later into the ranks of gods, Sītā then being turned into daughter of the earth, a deified furrow.<sup>18</sup> According to Weber, the characters of the *Rāmāyaṇa* are not historical persons but merely personifications of certain occurrences and situations. Sītā represents Aryan husbandry which has to be protected by Rāma, (*halabhrīt* =) the plough-bearer, against the attacks of the predatory aborigines—represented as inimical demons and giants, and friendly monkeys (who were strikingly ugly).<sup>19</sup> Wheeler regards the war between Rāma and Rāvaṇa as but a poetic version of the conflict between Brahmanism and Buddhism.<sup>20</sup> As stated earlier, Jacobi takes the Rāma story as result of the blending of History and allegory. He takes Rāma's conflict with Rāvaṇa as a new version of the Indra-Vṛitra myth of the *Ṛig-veda*, Rāma being equated with Indra. Sītā is the goddess of agriculture in the *Ṛig-veda*, and Hanūmat, the chief ally of Rāma in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is called 'Māruti', son of the Maruts, reminiscent of Indra's association with Maruts, the storm-gods.<sup>21</sup> According to some, the *Rāmāyaṇa* exhibits the progress of Aryan plough husbandry among the mountains and the fastnesses of central and southern India and the perils of the agricultural settlers from non-ploughing nomadic hunting tribes.<sup>22</sup>

In idealising the hero as the paragon of virtue, his adversaries have been portrayed as embodiments of sin and vice. The *Rāmāyaṇa* has thus an obvious allegorical significance and suggestiveness as indicated in the *Mohamudgara* of Śaṅkarāchārya, according to which the soul (Rāma) after crossing *moha* (in the form of forest), and killing *rāga* (passion) and *dvesha* (hatred) (symbolising the Rākshasas) shines resplendently united with *śānti* (peace) (in the form of Sītā).<sup>23</sup> There is also another inter-pretation which equates the *Rāmāyaṇa* with the Arthapāñchaka doctrine of the Vaiṣṇavas, stating Rāma

to be the God, Lakshmana, the soul, seeking God's grace (*śaraṇāyati*) as the means (*upāya*) and attainment (*prāpti*) of God as the goal (*phala*). It may, however, be remarked here that to stretch this idea of allegory and symbolism too far and to try to see symbolism in every character and incident in the *Rāmāyaṇa* would be absurd and would also be far from the intention of Vālmiki himself.<sup>24</sup>

(iv) Kāṭavīrya Arjuna and Paraśurāma : Finally we turn to Arjuna and Paraśurāma. The story of the Bhṛigu-Haihaya conflict and the parts played by Paraśurāma and Arjuna therein are well known to the students of the Purāṇas. Before offering an explanation of the story, a very brief account is given here in order to refresh memory and to facilitate appreciation of the new interpretation put on the story :

Bhārgavas, who dwelt in the lower Narmadā valley, were priests of Kṛitavīrya of the Haihaya branch of the Yādavas of the lunar dynasty, who bestowed great wealth on them. His successors, however, ill-treated the Bhārgavas, who fled into Madhyadeśa. Aurva Rīchika among them contracted matrimonial alliance with the Kshatriya royal house of Kānyakubja and a son Jamadagni was born to him. Arjuna, son of Kṛitavīrya, was a great conquerer and a samrāt, who became Sahasrabāhu through the favour of Daṭṭātreya. Capturing Māhishmatī from the Karkoṭaka Nāgas, Arjuna defeated Rāvāna of Laṅkā, brought him to Māhishmatī and later released him. Arjuna molested Jamadagni and forcibly carried away his celestial cow, Kāmadhenu. Later, Arjuna's sons killed Jamadagni. Paraśurāma, son of Jamadagni, who was away at the time, killed Arjuna and his sons, and in retaliation rid the earth of the Kshatriyas twenty-one times.<sup>25</sup>

In the *Vedic Age*, the present writer had given a brief explanation of the Bhṛigu-Haihaya relations on the basis of the interpretation of Shri Karandikar. On account of the importance of the subject, it is deemed necessary to deal with in some detail.<sup>26</sup>

Haihayas, scions of the Yādava family of the lunar dynasty, were great warriors, and Bhṛigus, though belonging to the priestly class, were great navigators, expert mariners, and enterprising tradesmen who controlled the trade between India and the western world, acting as intermediaries between Indians and the foreigners such as the Assyrians. They had amassed great wealth by helping foreigners at the cost of indigenous population. Māhishmatī on the Narmadā was a great trading centre which was the focus of the routes running north and south, and hence was the coveted prize by ancient rulers. Karkoṭaka Nāgas seized it from the Haihayas, but Kṛitavīrya recovered it. In order to secure the allegiance of the Bhṛigus and to alienate them from the Nāgas, Asuras, etc. Kṛitavīrya bestowed wealth on them. Arjuna, son of Kṛitavīrya, was a great warrior and spread the Haihaya sway far and wide. He wanted the trade and commerce of India to be under the control of Aryans, and did not like that the Bhṛigus, who were the agents of the foreigners, should prosper at the cost of the common man, and this was the main reason of the Bhṛigu-Haihaya conflict. Haihayas in his time were in need of money presumably for continuing their military operations, and they demanded the return of the wealth from the Bhṛigus. On their refusal, Haihayas pursued the Bhṛigus and recovered the wealth buried by them. Bhṛigus ran helter-skelter for safety, and one of them, Aurva (who, according to the Purāṇas was so named because he was brought up by his mother in secret in her thighs—*arua*—through the fear of the pursuing Haihayas) was probably brought up outside India in Ur. This supposition receives confirmation from the names of Aurva's son Rīchika, who appears to have been connected with Erech in Ur, possibly as ruler. In order to counter the attacks of the Haihayas, the Bhṛigus thought of entering into marital relations with the ruling families. Rīchika approached Gādhi for the hand of his daughter, with a view to open new trade-routes through Sindh which formed part of Gādhi's kingdom as indicated by his appellation Saindhavāyana, and successfully

fulfilled the condition precedent prescribed by Gādhī, in order to test Rīchīka's capacity for trade, of supplying a thousand horses. Rīchīka could supply the requisite number because Ur in those days dominated over horse-producing regions. A son Jamadagni was born to him, and Paraśurāma was born to Jamadagni.

Meanwhile, Arjuna made alliance with the Atris, rivals of the Bhr̥igus, and sought the help of Dattātreyā, who made him invincible in war. Datta made him Sahasrabāhu, i. e. possessing thousand ships. With these ships Arjuna became Anūpapati, invaded Laṅkā, and defeated Rāvaṇa through naval manœuvres; Rāvaṇa was brought a captive to Māhishmatī and released later. Arjuna ruled righteously and his police system was so efficient that nothing was said to be lost in his kingdom, and whatever was lost was made over to the owner by the king. In order to test the efficacy of incendiary arrows, Arjuna selected a solitary spot; but as ill luck would have it, one sage Āpava had his hermitage in the locality and one of the arrows discharged by Arjuna burnt that hermitage.

Paraśurāma, as the leader of the opposition against the Haihayas, carried a ruthless war and entirely eliminated the Haihayas from the Narmadā valley. He periodically continued his operations of liquidating the population in the Narmadā valley in order to blot out the traces of his ruthless wars and wipe out the memory of the popular ruler Arjuna. This is represented in the Purāṇas as Paraśurāma's killing the Kshatriyas twenty-one times. On the ruins of the Haihaya occupations in the Narmadā valley, Paraśurāma founded new cities and also colonised the region known as Aparānta in the west coast, where Śūrpāraka became a great trading centre.

It is possible, as urged by Pargiter, that the account as handed down by the Purāṇas, is "largely Brahmanical",<sup>97</sup> or to put it more correctly, a version under the Bhārgava influence.<sup>98</sup> The fact that barring his relations with the Bhr̥igus Arjuna is uniformly praised in all accounts shows that despite Bhārgava manipulations, the greatness of Arjuna could not be effaced.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cf. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, I, pp 327 ff.
2. *Mīmāṃsā-sūtras with Śābarabhāṣya and Tantravārtika*, Anandashram Sanskrit Series, I, pp. 206 ff.
3. *The Meaning of the Mahābhārata*, Bombay, 1957, p. 109.
4. Cf. *Vedic Age*, Appendix II.
5. Cf. B.C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, p. 121.
6. Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, p. 260.
7. *Journal of the Rama Varma Research Institute*, XII, p. 6.
8. *Rigveda*, X. 90
9. Prabhu, *Hindu Social Organization*, p. 292.
10. *Mbh.* (Cr. Ed.), I. 55. 43 ; cf. also, I. 54. 19.
11. Cf. Sukthankar, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
12. *Woolner Comm Vol*, pp. 311-318
13. Cf. Sukthankar, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
14. *Mystery of the Mahābhārata*, Vols. I-V, Karachi, 1931-35.
15. Wiesbaden, 1954, p. 1.
16. Sukthankar, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
17. *Ibid*, p. 90.
18. *Ind. Ant.*, II. 505.
19. *Ind. Ant.*, I. 120 ff.
20. *History of India*, II. 75, 221, etc.
21. *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, pp. 86, 127, 131, etc. ; Buleke, *Rāmakathā*, pp. 103-6.
22. Cf. Vaidya, *Riddle of the Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 64 ; Krishnamachariar, *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 18.
23. Cf. तीर्त्वा महादर्वीं हत्वा रागद्वेषांश्च राक्षसान् ।  
शान्तिसीतासमायुक्त आत्मोरामो विराजते ॥
24. The following stanza is a complete allegorisation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* :  
विद्यासीतावियोगक्षुभितनिजमुखः शोकमोहादितप्तः  
चेतः सौमित्रिमित्रो भवगहनगतः शास्त्रसुग्रीवसख्यः ।  
हृत्वास्ते दैन्यवालं मदनजलनिधौ वैर्येति तु विधाय  
विध्वस्ताबोधरक्षः पतिरधिगतचिज्जानकी स्वात्मरामः ॥  
—विभागशरीरे आर्यशिवरामः ।
25. Cf. Pargiter, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-200 ; 265-271 ; *Vedic Age*, pp. 279-283
26. *Vedic Age*, pp. 282-3. The account that follows in the next three paragraphs is based on the original articles in Marathi by Shri V. R. Karandikar published in the Marathi Weekly paper *Navā Kal* during 1932-3.
27. *op. cit.*, p. 267. According to Pargiter, "there is no Kshatriya version" of the story.
28. Just as considerable Bhārgava influence is evident in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* (cf. Sukthankar, *Annals BORI*, XVIII, pp. 1-76 ; Shende *Journal of the University of Bombay*, Sept. 1943), they influenced the *Purāṇas* also.

## व्यासमहिमा

( ब्रह्मपुराणम्, आनन्दाश्रमसंस्करणम् )

सर्वज्ञस्त्वं महाभाग देवेष्विव बृहस्पतिः ।  
नमस्यामो महाप्राज्ञं ब्रह्मिष्ठं त्वां महामुनिम् ॥  
येन त्वया तु वेदार्था भारते प्रकटीकृताः ।  
कः शक्नोति गुणान् वक्तुं तव सर्वान् महामुने ॥  
अधीत्य चतुरो वेदान् साङ्गान् व्याकरणानि च ।  
कृतवान् भारतं शास्त्रं तस्मै ज्ञानात्मने नमः ॥  
नमोऽस्तु ते व्यास विशालबुद्धे,  
फुल्लारविन्दायतपत्रनेत्र ।  
येन त्वया भारततैलपूर्णः,  
प्रज्वालितो ज्ञानमयः प्रदीपः ॥

( २४५।८-११ )

इतिहासपुराणज्ञं वेदवेदाङ्गपारगम् ॥  
सर्वशास्त्रार्थतत्त्वज्ञं पराशरसुतं प्रभुम् ।  
गुरुं प्रणम्य वक्ष्यामि पुराणं वेदसंमितम् ॥

( १।२८-२९ )

कुरुक्षेत्रे समासीनं व्यासं मतिमतां वरम् ।  
महाभारतकर्तारं सर्वशास्त्रविशारदम् ॥  
अध्यात्मनिष्ठं सर्वज्ञं सर्वभूतहिते रतम् ।  
पुराणागमवक्तारं वेदवेदाङ्गपारगम् ॥  
पराशरसुतं शान्तं पद्मपत्रायतेक्षणम् ।  
द्रष्टुमभ्याययुः प्रीत्या मुनयः संशितव्रताः ॥

( २६।६-८ )

( रामशांकर भट्टाचार्य )

# POLITICAL THOUGHT AND PRACTICE IN THE AGNI-PURĀṆA

By

DASHARATHA SHARMA

[ अग्निपुराणस्य पञ्चविंशतिरध्यायाः (२१८-२४२) राजनीतिविषयकाः ।  
तेषां विंशतिरध्यायाः ( २१८-२३७ ) पुष्करनीतिनाम्नीं पञ्चाध्यायाश्च  
( २३८-२४२ ) रामनीतिनाम्नीं राजनीतिं वर्णयन्ति । रामनीतिस्तु क्वचित्  
कौटिल्यस्यार्थशास्त्रं बहुत्र च कामन्दकीयं नीतिसारमनुसरति । उभेऽपि नीती  
परस्परं पूरके स्तः । तत्र पुष्करनीतौ २१८ अध्याये राज्याभिषेकस्य वर्णनं  
वर्तते । राजा ब्राह्मण-क्षत्रिय-वैश्य-शूद्रवर्णकैश्चतुर्भिर्मातृरभिषेचनीय इति  
विधानं तु राज्याभिषेकाय सर्वासां प्रजानां समर्थनमावश्यकमिति द्योतयति ।  
२२० अध्याये राज्ञ एकोनविंशतिः सहायाः ( सेनापत्यादयः ) उक्ताः ।  
कौटिल्येन तु 'समाहर्ता', 'प्रशास्ता' इत्यादयः केचिदन्येपि बहवः सहाया  
उक्ताः, परं ते उपलब्धस्याग्निपुराणस्य रचनाकालेऽप्रसिद्धिमप्रचारं च गता  
इत्यनुमीयते । २२१ अध्यायेऽनुजीविवृत्तं कथितम् । अस्याध्यायस्य बहूनां  
श्लोकानां कामन्दकीयनीतिश्लोकैः सह साम्यं स्पष्टं प्रतीयते—इति विदुषा लेखकेन  
सुनिदर्शनं प्रतिपादितम् । २२५ अध्याये सप्ताङ्गं राज्यं विद्याचतुष्टयं चोक्तम् ।  
२२९ अध्याये प्रसिद्धानां साम-दान-दण्ड-भेदाख्यानां चतुर्गामुपायानां स्थाने  
सप्तोपाया उक्ताः, येषु 'माया', 'उपेक्षा', 'इन्द्रजालं' चेति त्रयोधिका उपायाः  
कथिताः । २३३ अध्याये द्वादशराजमण्डलस्य वर्णनम् । तत्र—अरिमित्रमरेमित्रं  
मित्रमित्रमरिमित्रमित्रं चेति पञ्च विजिगीषोः पुरस्सराः, तथा 'पार्ष्णिप्राहाकन्द-  
पार्ष्णिप्राहासाराकन्दासारः' इति षष्ठतश्चत्वारः, विजिगीषुरेको मण्डलस्य नाभौ,  
अरेश्च विजिगीषोश्च भूम्यनन्तरो मध्यमः, मण्डलाद्बहिर्हृदासीनो य एतेषां  
संहतानामनुग्रहे व्यस्तानां च वधे प्रभुः । स्वभावतः कोऽपि मित्रमरिर्वा न जायते,  
अतो विजिगीषुणा धर्मविजयिना भाव्यम् । २३७ अध्याये 'सन्धिः, बिग्रहः,  
यानम्, आसनं, द्वैधीभावः, संश्रयश्च' इति षाड्गुण्यमुक्तम् । अत्र द्वैधीभावस्य  
संश्रयस्य च लक्षणं कौटिल्योक्तलक्षणात् कामन्दकोक्तलक्षणाच्च भिद्यते, विष्णु-  
धर्मोत्तरपुराणोक्तं लक्षणं चानुसरति । २३७ अध्याये विजयश्रियः स्तुतिर्वर्त-  
तेऽतः परं पुष्करनीतिः समाप्यते । अग्रिमेषु पञ्चस्वध्यायेषु रामनीतिरुक्ता, सा  
तु प्रायः कामन्दकीयतेः साररूपैव । अग्निपुराणस्य रामनीतियुक्तोऽयमंशो  
गुप्तराज्यकालादपि परवर्तिनि काले रचित आसीदिति लेखकस्य मतम् । ]

The *Agni-purāṇa* is one of the most interesting *paurāṇic* works, for instead of confining itself to a few set topics or even to the propagation of a definite sectarian theology and philosophy, it has essayed the ambitious task of giving in a nut-shell all knowledge, temporal as well as spiritual, lower as well as higher; and considering the limitations imposed by the space available to it, which in the edition with us<sup>1</sup> comes to about 800 pages, it has succeeded well enough in its objective. Its treatment of political thought and practice, with which we deal here, covers twenty-five chapters and, though to a certain extent wanting in originality, does not lack features which make it an interesting and useful study. Twenty of these chapters, have been ascribed to Pushkara, and five to Rāma; and the two sections are in some respects complementary. It may even be that the *Rāmanīti* is an addition by some political *pandit* who had thoroughly studied Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* (and even more than that the *Nītisāra* of Kāmandaka) and was eager to supply what had been left out by Pushkara. We shall have more to say about this in the lines that follow.

Pushkara's first chapter<sup>2</sup> deals with *rājyābhishheka* or royal consecration. From the constitutional point of view, the most important features of the ceremony, as described in the *Agni-purāṇa* are the proclamation of non-injury to all, release of prisoners, and the besprinkling of the ruler not only by the two *amātyas* of the highest castes, the Brāhmaṇa and the Kshatriya, but also by two others, one a Vaiśya and the other a Sūdra. Thus the ruler could, till then, claim to be the choice of all his people, the Sūdras included, and was expected to look after the welfare of everyone. Even dumb creatures and captives were not outside the sphere of his mercy. For the rest, there was plenty in the ceremony to give it sanctity as well as solemnity in the eyes of all. Earth of all types sanctified the ruler's body, experts in the four Vedas and the *Purohita* besprinkled him, the latter tying also the royal fillet (*paṭiābandha*) and putting the

1. We have used the *Gurumāṇḍala-granthamālā* edition published by Sri Mangalak Rai Mor, Calcutta, 1957.

2. Chapter 218 of the *Agni-purāṇa*, pp. 416-418.



crown on his head (*mukuta-bandha*). The ceremony appropriately ended with honour done to all and a royal procession along the *rājapatha* (the main thoroughfare of the city).

The second chapter<sup>1</sup> contains the *mantras* used at the time of the coronation and is on the whole more useful for religious than political thought of the period. Far more important than it, from our viewpoint, is the third chapter<sup>2</sup> giving a succinct account of the following assistants (*Sahāyas*) of the king:—

- (1) *Senāpati*—He was to be Kshatriya or a Brāhmaṇa.<sup>3</sup>
- (2) *Pratihāra* (Royal Chamberlain)—He had to be from a noble family and to be well versed in diplomacy. The *dauvārikas* (door-keepers) mentioned a few lines later probably were the *Pratihāra*'s assistants.
- (3) *Sāndhivigrahika*—As the minister concerned with *sandhi* (peace) and *vigraha* (war), he was naturally expected to be proficient in these matters.
- (4) *Dūta*—He was the king's envoy and was expected to be strong but soft-spoken.<sup>4</sup>
- (5) *Khadgadhārin*—Literally the word means a "sword-bearer." His being described as *rakṣaka*<sup>5</sup> shows that he was the King's body-guard<sup>6</sup>.
- (6) *Dhanādhyakṣa*—This officer was expected to know about jewels and precious articles and must therefore have been in charge of the royal treasury.<sup>7</sup>
- (7) *Antahpurādhyakṣa* was in charge of the inner apartments, i. e., the royal harem. He had to be a man well-advanced in years and was assisted by women of fifty years and over and men seventy years old.

---

1. Chapter 219 of the *Purāṇa*.

2. Chapter 220 of the *Purāṇa*,

3. of. *Matsya*, 215-10.

4. For his classification as निसृष्टार्थ (one with full powers), मितार्थ (with a limited objective), and शासनहारक (messenger), see chapter 141 of the text).

5. खड्गधारी रक्षक; स्यात्.

6. Called खड्गरक्ष in *Antiquities of Chamba*, No 25.

7. Can be compared with Kautilyan सन्निवाता,

- (8) *Gajādhyakṣha*, i. e. Superintendent in charge of elephants. He was assisted by *Gajārohas* (mahāwats).
- (9) *Hayādhyakṣha*, i. e., Superintendent in charge of the Cavalry.
- (10) *Sārathī*, the Charioteer, may have been also in charge of the royal chariots.
- (11) *Durgādhyakṣha*, literally means an officer in charge of a fort. But the central *durgādhyakṣha* might have been charaged with the general supervision of forts, of which there could have been many in a State under the immediate supervision of other officers.
- (12) *Sūdādhyakṣha* was in charge of the royal kitchen.
- (13) *Tāmbūladhārin* or *Tambūladhārin* had the duty of keeping betel leaves ready for the ruler.
- (14) *Vaidya*, the Royal Physician.
- (15) *Sthapati*, the Royal Architect.
- (16) *Astrāchārya*, the Professor teaching the use of various arms.
- (17) *Lekhaka*, a scribe.
- (18) *Sabhāsads*, i. e., members of the Royal Court. They were expected to be proficient in *dharma*, a fact which indicates the judicial functions of the *rāja-sabhā*.
- (19) A loyal person in charge of the *anuvāra*, probably a back-door.

We are further told that these officers were to be tested by means of various *upadhās* (temptations) and appointed according to their character and merit; and the royal supervision over them was not to cease even thereafter, for spies disguised as traders, *māntrikas*, astrologers, physicians, and ascetics were to look after their activities and of also the people whose affairs they managed. But this spying was used not merely to punish the disaffected but also to find out defects in one's administration and to remove it. Foreigners were given the right of seeking political asylum; but their doings were closely supervised.

The above account, it can be observed easily, deviates a good deal from that found in Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*. The *sahāyas* in the *Agni-purāṇa*—significantly enough they are not called *īrthas*—do not include the *Samāhartā*, *Prasāstā*, *Pradeshā*, *Paura-vyāvahārika*, *Kārmāntika*, *Mantriparishadādhyakṣa* and a good many other officers mentioned by Kauṭilya, probably either because the Kauṭilyan nomenclature had fallen into disuse or perhaps on account of the compiler's ignorance of administrative details. To us the first alternative seems to be nearer the truth. There is no place for a *Mantri-parishad*, a *Mantriparishadādhyakṣa*, or even some other *adhyakṣa*, in our later-day polity. Nor can we square the account of the *Purāṇa* with that in the *Sukranītisāra*, the Ministerial of which was in use neither in our ancient nor early medieval period of history. Disagreement with it being therefore no defect, we believe that the account of the king's assistants (*sahāyas*) in the *Agni-purāṇa* is not only reliable but in some ways indicative of the time and region where it was compiled.

The fourth chapter<sup>1</sup> is entitled "*anuṣṭi-vṛttam*," i. e., the Kauṭilyan *Arthaśāstra*, V, 4 and V, 5. The compiler's use of the *Kāmandakya-nītisāra* also is indicated by the following extracts:—

<i>Kāmandaka</i>	<i>Agni-purāṇa</i>
(a) <i>Vijānannapi na brūyad bhartuḥ kṣhiptvottaram vachan</i>	<i>Na kṣiped-vachanam rājño anukūlam priyam vadet</i>
(b) <i>Guhyakarma cha mantrañcha na bhartuḥ samprakāśayet</i>	<i>rājñā yacchēhrāvitaṁ guhyam na talloke prakāśayet</i>
(c) <i>Veśabhāṣānulanarṇam na kuryāt prithivīpateḥ</i>	<i>rājñāścha na tathā kāryam veśabhāṣāvicheshitam</i>
(d) <i>Strībhis-tadādarśibhiḥ pāpaiḥ vairidūtaiḥ-nirākṛitaiḥ</i>	<i>antaḥpuracharādhyakṣaiḥ vairabhūtaiḥ-nirākṛitaiḥ</i>

1. The absence of the *अनुष्टुप* for infantry should be indicative of the comparative insignificance of this arm when the *Purāṇa* was composed. For some other officers see Chapter 228.

2. Chapter 221 of the *Purāṇa*.

*ekārtiśācharyā-saṅghātāṃ*      *saṁsargāṃ na vrajēd bhṛītyo*  
*saṁsargāṃ cha vivarjayet*      .....

It is unnecessary, perhaps to give more extracts to prove the indebtedness of the one to the other.

The fifth chapter<sup>1</sup> takes up rather unaccountably the topic of *ḍurga-sanniveśa*, i. e. the foundation of (new) forts. But of the twenty-five verses of the chapter only three have any relevancy to the topic. The first three verses deal with *janapada*, the excellence of which lay in being :—

- (a) largely inhabited by Vaiśyas and Śūdras, and only to a limited extent by Brāhmaṇas,
- (b) independent of monsoons,
- (c) provided with plenty of food and water,
- (d) free from carnivorous animals and thieves, and
- (e) strong enough not to be invaded and conquered by the armies of an enemy.

Obviously, statesmen preferred then as now industrious cultivators in the countryside to men seeking white-collar jobs, and they had confidence also in their loyalty and capacity to defend themselves, in case the territory was invaded by any enemy.

The description of the *janapada* is based on Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra*, VI, 1 and V, II, 1, and is probably equally true of the conditions preceding as well as following the Christian era. The account of the various types of forts, as *ḍhanu* (desert), *mahā*, *nara*, *vārikṣha*, *ambu*, and *giri*, however, differs from that of Kautilya as well as Kāmandaka, who leave out *mahā* and *nara*, these two perhaps not being regarded as *ḍurga* or inaccessible. The remaining nineteen verses deal with a number of miscellaneous topics.

The next chapter, entitled, *Rājadharmā*<sup>2</sup>, begins with some administrative details, which carry the subject further, after the

---

1. Chapter 222 of the *Puṛaṇa*.

2. Chapter 223 of the *Puṛaṇa*.

parenthesis provide by the fifth chapter. The State was divided into *Vishayas*; these into groups of 100 villages; and these again into groups of 10 villages. The last unit consisted of one village. The heads of these various groups were provided with *bhoga* (*jagirs* or salary), in accordance with the work that they performed. It was the duty of the head of a village to put down disorder within his own jurisdiction, but if he could not do so, he appealed for assistance to the officer in charge of the next division.

We are further told that it was the king's duty to look well after his people. "What is the use of the sacrifices and penance of one whose people are not well-protected. To him whose people are well looked after, even his home is like heaven; the home of the ruler (on the other hand) who does not do so is hell. "The people are as afraid of royal favourites and thieves as a lovely lady of rogues. They are devoured by them and specially by the *kāyasthas* (scribes). Protected from the fear arising from them, the people really become the *prajā* (off-spring) of the ruler."

Details of some fines and cesses have also been given in this chapter. The ruler was a trustee of the property of minors. "If one attempted to take away, during their life-time, the property of chaste women, widows, and women who were ill, the ruler was to regard such kinsmen as thieves and punish them accordingly."

It is enjoined that a ruler should not have any tax from Brāhmaṇa. But workers, skilled as well as unskilled, were to work once a month for the ruler.

The seventh chapter<sup>1</sup> partly deals with the behaviour of women. The rest of it consists of recipes for the production of scented oil, cosmetics and the like, though they need not have formed part of a political discourse. More relevant than it is the eighth chapter<sup>2</sup> which deals with the following topics :—

- (a) *Rājaputras* (Princes) who, we are told, should be educated well, given good company, and trained in administrative work.
- (b) Vices and faults which a ruler should not have.
- (c) Gaining control over the bureaucracy as well as his people, urban as well as rural.
- (d) Vanquishing of external enemies, classified as *kulya* (of one's own family), *anantara* (an adjoining ruler), and *kṛtrima* (artificial).
- (e) *Saptāṅga-rājya* of which the ruler is said to be the *mūla* (root).
- e) *Mantraṇā* (taking counsel) which could be with many advisers separately, but the final policy based on which had to be decided by the ruler himself.
- (f) Four *vidyās*, *trayī*, *daṇḍavidyā*, *ānvīkṣikī*, and *arthavidyā*.
- (g) Some general instructions regarding a ruler's conduct.

As the number of verses devoted to these topics totals only thirty, their treatment is necessarily sketchy.

The ninth chapter<sup>1</sup> which deals with *upāyas* (various means used in statecraft) is introduced with four very good verses about the place of will and destiny in a man's life, the last of which states, "One gets a good crop, in due course, as a result of a combination of cultivation and rain. Let a man perform his religious duties and also put in effort; let him neither be lazy nor dependent on fate". The operation of fate is not ruled out, but a writer who could say that "adverse fate could be offset by a man's effort" was surely no fatalist.

Of the *upāyas* the *Agni-purāṇa* has seven, the three additional ones, besides the usual *sāma*, *dāna*, *bheda* and *daṇḍa* being *māya*, *upakṣhā* and *indrajāla*.<sup>2</sup> *Daṇḍa*, or force was to be used only when the other methods failed; and even then to be

---

1. Chapter 226 of the *Purāṇa*

2. The classification comes from the कामन्दक-नीतिसार

used with proper care, for *daṇḍa*, though the most effective means of controlling the world, could destroy one who used it improperly.

The chapter ends with the statement that the king was like the Sun because of his prowess, like the Moon on account of giving pleasure to the people, like Air because of pervading the whole world through his spies, like Yama as he put an end to offences, like Fire for the reason that he burnt the people who had bad propensities, like Kubera on account of the gifts he gave to Brāhmaṇas, like Varuṇa as he showered money, like Pārthiva because of his patience and forgiveness, and like Hari on account of the protection he gave by means of his *utsāha*, and *mantra śaktis* etc.

The tenth chapter<sup>1</sup> deals in the main with *daṇḍa*, in the sense of fines and punishments, imposed for various offences. The fines of 250, 500, and 1,000 *paṇas* were known respectively as *prathama-sāhasa*, *madhyama-sāhasa* and *uttamasāhasa*, we give below illustrations of some fines.<sup>2</sup> Incidentally we have here also an account of weights and measures.<sup>3</sup> Of officers this chapter mentions the *amātya*, *prāḍvivāka*, *rāshṭrādhikṛita*, and *dāṇḍika*, thus supplementing the meagre details of administration, given in an earlier chapter. *Amātya* is a word used for almost every high Officer, specially perhaps for departmental heads. In this chapter the *amātya* is connected with judicial

---

1. Chapter 227 of the *Purāṇa*

2. (a) On getting a girl married to a boy without telling his defects 200 *Paṇas*  
 (b) Giving a girl to another after promising her to some one else 1,000 „  
 (c) Deliberately damaging a reservoir, a house, or a garden 500 „  
 (d) Insulting one's superiors 1,000 „

3. The weights given are :—

3 यव = 1 कृष्णाल	16 माष = 1 सुवर्ण
5 कृष्णाल = 1 माष	4 सुवर्ण = 1 निष्क
60 कृष्णाल = 1 कर्ष	10 सुवर्ण = 1 धरण

A copper काषपिण weighed one कर्ष

functions. The *prāḍvivāka* is a judge. The word, though probably of great antiquity,<sup>1</sup> does not find a place in Kaṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*. The *Rājprādhikṛta* might be equated with Governor. From the way the word is mentioned in the *Agni-purāṇa*, it would appear that such officers were not unoften big feudatories.<sup>2</sup> The *Dāṇḍika* was a police officer and can be equated with the more usual word, *daṇḍapāśika*.

The eleventh chapter<sup>3</sup> gives the conditions under which a ruler could lead an invasion or a raid : but curiously enough these conditions are a strange mixture of statecraft and priestcraft, and the latter gets expended into full four chapters that follow. The first half of the sixteenth chapter<sup>4</sup> also is devoted to this subject, after which we have an account of the well-known *maṇḍala* theory. In front of the *jigīṣhu*, respectively, were the *ripu* (enemy), *suhid* (friend), *śatru-mitra* (friend of the enemy), *mitra-mitra* (friend of the friend) and *mitramitra-ripu* (enemy of the friend's friend). At the back of the *jigīṣhu* or the ruler desirous of expending his dominions were *pārśhṇigrāha* (the enemy at the rear), *ākṛanda* (friend at the rear to whom one could call out for help in need), *āsāra* (the *pārśhṇigrāha*'s friend), and *ākṛandāsāra* (the friend of the *ākṛanda*). Definitions of the words, *Mudhyasthu*, who adjoins both the *jigīṣu* and the *ripu* and is stronger than both of them and the *Udāsīna*, who is stronger than these all, have been given in verses 18-19. And then one is told that none is really a friend or foe. It is conditions and causes that create friends and enemies. Let the *jigīṣhu* be a *dharmavijayī*<sup>5</sup> and bring the people

1. Its derivation by Nārada and Kaṭyāyana is quoted in the *Smṛti-chandrikā*, II, p. 14 and *Vyavahāramātṛikā* respectively (see Kane's *HOD*, III, p. 272).

2. राष्ट्रं राष्ट्रधिकृतान् सामन्तान् पापिनो हरेत् ॥२३॥

3. Chapter 228.

4. Chapter 233 of the *Agni-purāṇa*. Some details of the theory are given also in Chapter 240.

5. For the conception of a conqueror as धर्मविजयी, लोभविजयी and प्रभुविजयी see Kaṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, XII, 1. A धर्मविजयी is satisfied with the offer of mere allegiance. He wants no land.



under his control by means that do not arouse disaffection and make them trust him.

The seventeenth chapter<sup>1</sup> is entitled *śhāḍguṇya* or Six-fold Policy ; and begins with a short description of the *upāyas*. As some of them, however, have already been dealt with fully or partially in the earlier chapters, this one confines itself to the use of *danḍa* in *paradeśa* (the enemy's territory), *upekshā*, *māyā* and *indrajāla*. In case the ruler's advantage and strength was merely equal to that—of the enemy, he was to resort to *upekshā* i. e., indifference and neutrality. Showing various *utpātas* (bad omens) by artificial means constituted *māyā*, included among which were also false prophecies by ascetics and astrologers. By means of *indrajāla*, one could show gods fighting on his own side and the enemies being destroyed.

The six-fold policy proper included *sandhi*, *vigraha*, *yāna*, *āsana*, *dvaidhībhāva* and *saṁśraya*. *Sandhi* is making an agreement; *vigraha* means harming another (by fighting); *yāna* is marching out against the enemy; staying in one's own country in case of conflict is *āsana*; *dvaidhībhāva* is marching out with half the army; if one takes refuge with either the *madhyastha* or the *udāsīna*, the policy adopted is called *saṁśraya*. In case of the first two terms, *sandhi* and *vigraha*, the *Agni-purāṇa* adopts Kauṭilyan definitions. But as Kauṭilyan *āsana*, with the meaning given as *upekshanam*, has been turned by the *Purāṇa* into an *upāya*, it defines *āsana* in the sense given above. Kauṭilya's definition of *dvaidhībhāva* as *sandhivigraha-pādānam* can mean either that the ruler makes peace with one king and adopts a hostile attitude towards another or that he is outwardly submissive to both the strong kings who border his territories but pursues actually a policy that is unknown to either of them. The latter interpretation has been adopted by Kāmandaka in his *Nītisāra*, XVI, 23. The definition adopted by the *Agni-purāṇa* comes from a different source and should be compared with that found in the *Vishṇudharmottara-purāṇa*, II. 150. 3-5 and the *Mitāksharā* on the *Yājñavalkya-smṛiti*,

1. Chapter 234 of the *Purāṇa*.

I. 346. Its definition of *saṁśraya* also agrees with that of the *Viṣṇu-dharmottara Purāṇa*. In case of danger from a foe in the rear (*aśuddha-pārśvā*), the ruler was to have recourse to *dvaiddhāva*, i. e., he was to leave behind a part of the army while marching out with another against an enemy in the front. When one found himself wholly unable to face a very strong enemy, one could have *saṁśraya*; but it was to be the last weapon to be employed from the ruler's diplomatic armoury. It was, we are told, the worst of the six policies.

The eighteenth chapter<sup>1</sup> opens with an account of the king's time-table:—

- (a) Getting up two *mulūrtas* before dawn.
- (b) Seeing the spies, without anyone knowing that they were his employees.
- (c) Listening to an account of his Income and Expenditure.
- (d) Bath etc.
- (e) *Sandhyā* and worship of Vāsudeva.
- (f) *Homa*, *tarpaṇa* of the *pitṛis*, *godāna*, etc,
- (g) Going to the *Sabhā* after receiving the *guru's* blessing and seeing there Brāhmaṇas, *amātyas*, *mantrins*, and the people brought in by the *pratihāra*, with his permission.
- (h) Listening to *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa*, as well as the programme for the day.
- (i) Looking to judicial matters.
- (j) *Mantraṇā* which was to be neither with one, nor with too many, nor with those who were foolish and did not wish him well.
- (k) Exercise.
- (l) Bath and seeing Viṣṇu worshipped, fire having *homa*, and the Brāhmaṇas honoured.
- (m) Meal, *tāmbūla-bhaktshana* (chewing betel leaves), and thinking of religious matters.

---

1. Chapter 235 of the *Purāṇa*.

- (n) Inspection of one's forces, treasury and armoury.
- (o) Evening *sandhyā*, looking to other state affairs, and despatching spies.
- (p) Dinner, going to the inner apartments, listening to music etc.

Kauṭilya's account perhaps supplied the model for all such time-tables, later writers introducing changes here and there according to their religious beliefs and inclinations. The account that we have here is nearer to that of the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, X. 70, 4-17 and the *Vishṇudharmottara*, II, 151, than to that found even in the *Manusmṛiti* and the *Yājñavalkya-smṛiti*, which come earlier and are nearer to Kauṭilya.

The next chapter<sup>1</sup> deals with battles, the first step for which was a week-long worship of gods. In case the battle was won by an *amātya*, the *ratnas* (jewels etc.) were the ruler's share, and the women of none. If the hostile ruler was captured in a battle, he was to be treated as one's own son. These are good rules; but it is difficult to be sure of their actual observance by people.

The twentieth chapter<sup>2</sup> contains a hymn to Śrī, the goddess who gave victory in battles; and with it ends the portion dealing with Pushkara's *nṛti*, which with its strong Brāhmaṇical tinge is half statecraft and half religion and religious rites brought into connection with statecraft by *paṇḍits*. After this follows *Rāmanṛti* in five chapters; and as already pointed out, it is much more secular in its conception and nearer to Kauṭilya's teaching than the *nṛti* of Pushkara, summarised above.

The first verse of the *Rāmanṛti*, that a king's work is of four types, to collect money by good means, protecting and increasing it and then to pass it on to deserving people is almost a verbal quotation from the *Kāmandaka nṛtisāra*, I, 20;<sup>3</sup> and

---

1. Chapter 236 of the *Purāṇa*. 2. Chapter 237 of the *Purāṇa*.  
3. *Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series*, No. 136.

the next four verses also come from the same source. Then the *Purāṇa* reproduces *Kāmandaka*, I, 27, 57; II, 1, 7, 32; V, 7, 8, 9, 21, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, showing thereby that the *Rāmanīti* is largely *Kāmandakanīti* severely summarised, and that this part of the *Agnī-purāṇa* comes much later than the Gupta Period. The precepts, of course, are all good. *Naya* is to be had through *vinaya* which is identical with control over the senses. The *vidyās* which help the ruler are four, *ānvāleshikā*, *trayā*, *vārtā* and *daṇḍanīti*. It is the duty of a king to be kind to all, and specially to those who are poor. Courtesy on his part is not only a virtue but the best policy.

The second chapter of the *Rāmanīti*<sup>1</sup> deals with the seven constituents of a State which we find barely referred to in chapter 7 of the *Pushkara-nīti*; here they are discussed in some detail. There is a close correspondence between the *Kāmandakanītisāra* and the *Agnīpurāṇa* which reproduces *Kāmandaka* IV, 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31-8, 49, 50, 52-57, 60-1, 63-66, 69-72; V, 15, 18, 31, 47 etc.

The next chapter deals with *śābdagunya*, a topic already taken up in the seventeenth chapter of the *Pushkara-nīti*, but the details given here are different to a great extent, though not wholly. The chapter reproduces *Kāmandaka*, VIII, 16-19; IX, 1-4, 20, 23, 24-27; X, 1-5, 19-22, 26, 24; XI, 25, 6, 28, 29 etc., and summarises its views on *yāna* and *āsana*.

The fourth chapter<sup>2</sup> of the *Rāmanīti* begins with the statement that *mantra-śakti* is superior to the two other *śaktis* called *prabhāva* and *utsāha*. The details are again from the *Kāmandaka-nītisāra*; and verse after verse gets repeated. The section on the *dāta* which covers verses 7-12 is from the same source. With verse 14 begins the account of the *vyasanas* or calamities and defects that can afflict a *rājya-prakṛiti*. Beginning with the definition of a *vyasana* from *Kāmandaka*, XIII, 19 and

- 
1. Chapter 239 of the *Purāṇa*.
  2. Chapter 240 of the *Purāṇa*.
  3. Chapter 241 of the *Purāṇa*.

its enumeration of the *vyasanas* in XIII, 20 the *Purāṇa* goes on to quote also other verses from it, fathering everything, no doubt, on Rāma, and severely abridging the text here and there. The account of the *skandhāvāra*, again, verses 42 ff., has nothing original about it. It is taken from *Kāmandaka*, XVI. The *upāyas* are from *Kāmandaka*, XVII; and the account is concluded with *Kāmandaka*, XVII, 54-59.

The last chapter of the *Rāmanīti*<sup>1</sup> deals with the way an attack should be organised, and, as in other cases, happens to be based on *Kāmandakanītisāra*. It utilises cantos XVIII and XIX of the book.

On the whole the *Rāmanīti* is a good abridgement of the *Kāmandakanītisāra* and the editors of these works might usefully utilise one text to find out the right text of the other, and also to note some important variant readings. Its own contribution to political thought lies only in its bringing to our notice the fact that by the time of the compilation of the *Purāṇa*, *Kāmandakanītisāra* had attained antiquity enough to be fathered on an *avatāra* like Rāma. *Pushkara-nīti* with all its irrelevancy, prolixity, and indebtedness here and there to *Kāmandaka* probably gives us a better idea of the political thought and practice of the period when the *Agni-purāṇa* was composed than this supplement undeservedly given the name of *Rāmanīti*. It has nothing of the lofty-mindedness of Rāma.

---

1. Chapter 242 of the *Purāṇa*.

# THE MARKANDEYA PURĀṆA : EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

By

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

[ अस्मिन्लेखे मार्कण्डेयपुराणस्य प्रचलितान्यप्रचलितानि च विभिन्नानि मुद्रितसंस्करणानि भाषान्तराणि चोपवर्णितानि । दुर्गासप्तशत्युपनामकं देवीमाहात्म्यमेतत्पुराणान्तरवर्त्यतीव प्रसिद्धो ग्रन्थः । अनेन पुराणेनाधुनिकानामपि भारतीयानां विदेशीयानां च विदुषां ध्यानमाकर्षितम् । अस्य ग्रन्थस्य बहूनि संस्करणानि मूलपाठात्मकानि सभाषान्तराणि च प्रकाशितानि, अनेकासु प्राच्यभाषासु पाश्चात्यभाषासु चास्य भाषान्तराण्युपलभ्यन्ते । एवं देवीमाहात्म्यस्यापि बहूनि पाठसंस्करणानि भाषान्तराणि चोपलभ्यन्ते । अत्र लेखे मार्कण्डेयपुराणस्य सर्वेषामेवेष्टशानां मूलपाठात्मकानां सभाषान्तराणां च संस्करणानां विस्तृता सूची ससिवरणा प्रकाशयते ।

अस्यां सूच्यां मार्कण्डेयपुराणस्य मूलपाठमात्रात्मकानि षट् संस्करणानि वर्णितानि, यथा—विजिलयोथिका-इण्डिकासंस्करणं ( १८६२ ई० ), २ जीवरखनशास्त्रिसम्पादितं लखनऊसंस्करणं ( १८६५ ई० ), ३ पूनासंस्करणं ( १८६७ ई० ), ४ जीवानन्दविद्यासागरसंस्करणं ( १८७३ ई० ), ५ वैकटेश्वर-प्रेससंस्करणं ( १८८८, १९१० ई० ), ६ पञ्चाननतर्करत्नसम्पादितं बंगवासि-प्रेससंस्करणं च ( १८९० ई० ) ।

सभाषान्तरमूलपाठयुतानि षट् संस्करणानि—१ के० एम० बनर्जीकृत-आङ्गलभाषान्तरसहितमपूर्णं संस्करणं ( १८५१ ई० ), २ महेशचन्द्रपाल-सम्पादितं बंगलाभाषान्तरसहितं बंगाक्षरपाठयुतं संस्करणं ( १८९० ई० ), ३ रघुराजद्वेकृत-हिन्दीभाषान्तरसहितं लखनऊस्थानात्प्रकाशितं संस्करणं ( १९०८ ई० ), ४ बंगलाभाषान्तरसहितं बंगाक्षरपाठयुतं बंगवासिप्रेससंस्करणं ( १९१० ई० ), ५ पद्यात्मक-बंगलाभाषान्तरसहितं बंगाक्षरपाठयुतं संस्करणं, ६ कलकत्ताभाषान्तरसहितं दक्षिणभारतीयाक्षरपाठयुतं जयचमरेन्द्रग्रन्थमालासंस्करणं च ।

केवलभाषान्तरात्मकानि च चत्वारि संस्करणानि—१ पार्जितरक्तं आङ्गल-भाषान्तरं कलिकातास्थानात्प्रकाशितं ( १८८८-१९०५ ई० ), २ चारुचन्द्र-मुखर्जीकृतं आङ्गलभाषान्तरमपूर्णं ( १८९३ ई० ), ३ मन्मथनाथदत्तकृतम् आङ्गलभाषान्तरं ( १८९६ ई० ) ४ बनारसस्थानात् आर्यमहिलाहितकारिणी-परिषदा प्रकाशितं हिन्दीभाषान्तरं ( १९३१ ) च ।

एतेषां संस्करणानां सम्पादने प्राचीनाः कोशाः प्रायेण न सम्यगाकलिताः, भाषान्तराण्यपि न वैज्ञानिकपद्धत्या कृतानि । एतेषु संस्करणेषु स्थाने स्थाने भ्रष्टोऽप्रमाणिकश्च पाठो वर्तते । पार्जितरक्तस्य आङ्गलभाषान्तरस्य समालोचनाऽप्यत्र निबन्धकारेण कृता । अस्मिन् भाषान्तरेऽनेकानि स्खलितान्यत्र प्रदर्शितानि । पार्जितरमहोदयद्वारा कृतानि कानिचित् पाठसंशोधनान्यपि समालोचितानि । ]

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, especially its Devīmāhātmya section has attracted the attention of the modern scholarly world. For more than a century various editions have been published at different places from time to time and translations into various languages of the east and the west have been issued independently as well as with text-editions.

A list is given below of the editions and translations which I have seen or about which I have found references.

1823. The Saptasatī or Chāṇḍī-Pāṭha (or Devīmāhātmya) Translated from the Sanscrit into English by Cavali Venkata Rama Swami, Pundit, Calcutta. Numerous editions of the text of this very popular portion of this work and of its translations into various languages have been issued from time to time. But these need not attract our attention for the time being.

1851. Edition with English translation by K. M. Banerjea upto VIII, 21 (Purāṇa Saṅgraha, No. 1), Calcutta.

1862. Bibliotheca Indica Edition by K. M. Banerjea, Calcutta.

1865. Text Edited by Jiv(a)rakhan(a) Shastrin, Lucknow.

1867. Text Edition, Poona.

1873. Text Edition by J. Vidyasagar, Calcutta.

1883. Edition with Hindi and Urdu translations, Lucknow.

1888. Text Edition, Venkateswar Press, Bombay.

1888—1905. English Translation by E. Pargiter, Calcutta.

1890. Text Edition by Panchanana Tarkaratna. Vangavasi Press, Calcutta.

Several editions of the text and Bengali Translation were issued. The fourth edition embodying in one volume the text in Bengali characters and Bengali translation was issued in 1316 B. S. (= 1910).

1890. Text in Bengali characters with Bengali translation. Mahesh Chandra Pal, Calcutta.

1893. English translation upto Ch. XL (?) by Charu Chandra Mukherjea, Calcutta.

1896. English translation by Manmath Nath Dutt, Calcutta.

1908. Edition with Hindi translation by Raghuraja Dube. Second Edition, Lucknow.

1910. Venkateswar Press edition. Third Edition, Bombay.

It is stated that the Press issued the work in three forms : text, translation (into Hindi ?) as well as text and translation in the same volume.

1931. Hindi translation. Second Edition. Ed. Govinda Sastri Dugvekar. Arya Mahila Hitakarini Mahaparisad, Banaras.

1953. Text in South Indian Script with kannada Translation (Ch. I—24). Sri Jayacamarendragranthamala, No. 53, Vol. I.

Text in Bengali characters and metrical Bengali translation.

None of these appear to have been a strictly Critical edition based on the proper Collation and analysis of manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> A few variants are noted in the fragment issued

---

1. This is a desideratum from which other Purāṇas also suffer. For the Purāṇas, though constituting mines of valuable information concerning the life and culture of India for many centuries, were not given the amount of attention they so richly deserved at least as seriously and as thoroughly as other branches of literature. Very few of them have commentaries on them and the texts as preserved in numerous manuscripts are far from satisfactory. It was only the ordinary people who took interest in them. There were persons who recited and explained them but their social status was not very high.



by Rev. K. M. Banerjea in the Purāṇa Saṅgraha Series as well as in the edition published by the Vanganasi Press. No variant is recorded in other editions including the Bibl. Ind. edition which is stated to have followed Bengal Manuscripts. Save a few variant readings here and there, the text as presented in the different editions is almost uniform. It may be, the readings in cases are corrupt and proper collation of Manuscripts might lead to their correction. As matters stand now there are quite a number of passages which are rather obscure baffling all attempts at interpretation. It is a pity that translators have not usually drawn attention to the difficult passages and have given free translations which are not always very happy. It must be confessed that the translation in many cases of comparatively easier passages is also far from satisfactory. Defects of the translations of this Purāṇa as of many other similar texts have seldom been detected as they are not as a rule consulted by Sanskrit-Knowing people and they are rarely compared with the originals by those who have occasion to use them.

It is true, Pargiter among all other translators has occasionally drawn attention to the unintelligible and difficult passages and tried to solve the difficulty by suggesting emendations, but they are rarely happy. In some cases, however, the emendations are absolutely uncalled for or even ridiculous as in 16.68 (*āryayā* for *āryāyā*), 16.84 (*tava* for *mama*) and 20. 11 (*saṁyuktah* for *saṁyuktaṁ*, where *śchakruḥ* appears to be a printing mistake for *chakruḥ*).

Pargiter's translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa is well-known for its valuable notes on Botanical, Zoological and especially Geographical terms. These have secured well-deserved reputation for the work. But as I was revising it on behalf of the Asiatic Society which has undertaken the publication of a second edition, a number of glaring defects came to my notice and I considered it necessary to draw the attention of scholars to them before I correct them so that they may have an idea of the changes made. It may be

pointed out that these defects in the work of a foreigner for whom it is difficult to follow the rather complicated construction of sentences and fine implications of expressions of an old classical language like Sanskrit are overshadowed by numerous other qualities of the work as well as by his invaluable contributions to the study of the Purāṇas.

Pargiter has generally made the translation too literal often failing to convey the sense required by the context or familiar to the Indian people. He translates :

*antyeshti* (3.46) as 'final sacrifice', *rūpa* (5.12, 14) as 'form', *tridāsa* (5.19) as 'thirty godes', *supalvalamahāvanam* (6.9) as 'a great forest abounding in pools', *yamaśau* (5.23) as 'yama's two sons', *parām prītim* as 'perfect affection', *Vipramukhyebhyaḥ* (7.20)—'to Brahmins principally', *śradhayā pūtam* (7.63) as 'funeral ceremony', *garbhaduḥkḥāni* (10.20) as 'troubles in the stomach', *bhṛityavarga* (14.84) as 'relatives', *bhartṛipinḍa* (15.5) as 'brother's pinḍa', *paradārābhimarsha* (15.9) 'improperly touching another's wife', *paralokī* (15.42) 'other people', *satkriyābhyaśanam* (15.44) 'hospitality and study', *saddharma* (15.44) 'truth and righteousness', *trisapta* (18.27) as 'three worlds', *ucchekḥishṭaḥ* or *uchchekḥishṭam* (18.28, 30) as 'impure with remnants of food', *lakṣmīyā samākrāntā* (18.55)—'their heads being assailed by Lakshmi', *uparodḍhuḥ* (19.5) 'to obstruct', *prasādasumukhaśte* *ham* (19.13) 'my face is very gracious to thee', *samprāpta*, *varudakṣiṇaḥ* (19.27) 'complete with gifts and fees'.

There are cases where the basis of his interpretation is not quite clear. Here are a few examples :

*Sthānavaśiṣṭhavasampanna* (4. 4)—'observing the beauties of various passages', *mukhadoshavivarjitān* (4. 8)—'faces free from blemishes', *darsanotsukī* (4. 9)—'eager for learning', *anāmayam oha paprachekhuḥ* (4. 15)—questioned him with due respect', *kacchakṣite kuśalam* (4. 19)—'We trust that all is well', *Survabhūtaḥite rataḥ* (5. 9)—'delighted', *Sa eva saṁsmṛitāḥ sadyaḥ samuddhartābhavan nṛṇām* (19. 26)—he it was who was ever remembered as the upholder of mankind', *anashṭadravyatā* (19. 27)—'exemption from impoverishment', *bhāgabhujikriyām* (20. 11)—'business of kings'.

The translation occasionally raises interesting points some of which deserve special attention. In chapter VI the story is related how Balarāma on a casual visit to a hermitage killed Sata who was engaged in narrating mythological stories before the sages, because he did not rise up and show respect to the former as did the other sages. The resulting situation is thus described.

अध्यास्यति पदं ब्राह्मं तस्मिन् सूते निपातिते ।  
 निष्क्रान्तास्ते द्विजाः सर्वे बलात् कृष्णाजिनाम्बराः ॥  
 अवधूतं तथात्मानं मन्यमानो हलद्युधः ।  
 चिन्तयामास सुमहत् मया पापमिदं कृतम् ॥  
 ब्राह्मं रथानं गतो ह्येष यत् सूतो विनिपातितः ।  
 तथा ह्रीमे द्विजाः सर्वे मामवेक्ष्य विनिर्गताः ॥

VI. 30—2.

This has been translated thus :—"when that bard was slain while repeating the words of the Vedas, all those Brahmanas clad in black antelope skin departed from the wood. And the plough-armed hero, perceiving himself disregarded thought, 'This is a very grievous sin that I have committed ; for since I have come here to a Brahmana's abode and have slain Sata, these dvijas perceiving me have all departed.'"

The difficulty centres round the expressions *brāhmapada* and *brāhmasthāna* which are differently translated by different translators failing both to do justice to the language and to make the sense clear and logical. Pargiter's translation is not warranted by the language, more particularly in the case of verse 32. Datta's and Mukherjea's translations as 'Brahmā's dignity' or 'Brahmā's region' are ridiculous as attaining this dignity or region is a thing to be coveted and not a matter for regret. The gravity of the offence Committed by Balarāma lies in the fact that he killed Sata who was occupying a dignified position at least for the time being as he was engaged in explaining the Purāṇas and holding the *Brahmāsana* similar to what is called *Vyāsāsana*, the seat of the Purāṇa-narrator, in Bengal. We are told in other Purāṇas (Skanda, Brahmakhaṇḍa, 19.29

and Bhāgavata X. 78. 30) that Brahmāsana was specially assigned to Sata by the sages and Balarāma was wrong in killing him when he was in that respectable position. It was for this reason that the sages assembled there felt offended and left the place forthwith.

Chapter VII begins by giving a description of the good effects of the rule of King Hariścandra. Incidentally it is stated—

नाजायन्त स्त्रियश्चैव काश्चिदप्राप्तयौवनाः (VII. 3)

'No woman ever gave birth to children before she attained her youth'—M. N. Dutt's Translation. Charuchandra Mukherjea who translates in a similar manner proceeds to add the following remark :

This shows that in ancient times that bane of our Society, viz., early marriage, which has destroyed our national stamina like a canker eating into the tender petals of a rose, was not in vogue amongst us.

Pargiter who translates it 'nor were any females born who failed to reach womanhood' suspects here an allusion to infanticide.

As a matter of fact, there is scarcely any reference here to any social good or evil. We have here an instance of the spirit of exaggeration of which our ancient poets were very fond and this led to the statement that 'no women were born who were not youthful' meaning that all women were beautiful from their birth. Meghadūta II. 4. refers to a similar condition.

Pargiter's translation of *bhṛityavarga* as relatives in XIV. 84 which decries the taking of sweetmeats by an individual alone when *bhṛityas*, friends and guests are looking on may be due to the failure to appreciate the position occupied by a servant in an Indian family.

In verses XVI. 80-4 Anasūyā demonstrates her powers acquired through her serving her husband. But Pargiter

interprets them in a different way and has to take recourse to emendations for the purpose. The idea might not have appealed to him or he might have been unaware of it.

Pargiter has corrected many of the apparent printing mistakes of the Bibliotheca Indica edition. But sometimes he did not detect the printing mistakes and this affected his translation considerably. XVIII. 27 is an example where *prāptam*, evidently a printing mistake for *prāptum* is accepted as the correct reading. *Kshārāvasevanam* (8. 63), *Kshayabuddhyudaya* (X. 16) *Simasimāyante* (XII. 37), *triṇunmaprabhavam dvivam* (13. 16) also seem to be nothing but printing mistakes for *ośchana*, *oṛiddhyudaye*, *oṃyante*, *oḍaivo* respectively.

—:O:—

## पुराण-रत्नानि

प्रज्ञाप्राकारसंयुक्तमस्थिस्थूणं पुरं महत् ।  
 चर्मभित्तिमहारोधं मांसशोणितलेपनम् ॥  
 नवद्वारं महायासं सर्वतः स्नायुवेष्टितम् ।  
 नृपश्च पुरुषस्तत्र चेतनावानवस्थितः ॥  
 मन्त्रिणौ तस्य बुद्धिश्च मनश्चैव विरोधिनौ ।  
 यत्ते वैरनाशाय तावुभाबितरेतरम् ॥  
 नृपस्य तस्य चत्वारो नाशमिच्छन्ति विद्विषः ।  
 कामः क्रोधस्तथा लोभो मोहश्चान्यस्तथा रिपुः ॥  
 यदा तु स नृपतिस्तानि द्वाराण्यावृत्य तिष्ठति ।  
 तदा सुस्थबलश्चैव निरातङ्कश्च जायते ॥

( मार्कण्डेय पु०, जीवा० संस्क०, ३।५९-६३ )

## पुराण-महत्त्वम्

ऋचः सामानि छन्दांसि पुराणं यजुषा सह ।

उच्छिष्टाञ् जज्ञिरे सर्वे दिवि देवा दिविश्रितः ॥

( अथर्व० ११।७।२४ )

अस्य महतो भूतस्य निश्चितमेतद्यद्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्वाङ्गिरस  
इतिहासः पुराणं ... ॥

( बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद् २।४।१० )

..... पुराणं श्रुतिसंमतम् ।

मङ्गलं मङ्गलार्हं च मङ्गल्यं मङ्गलालयम् ॥

सर्वमङ्गलबीजं च सर्वदा मङ्गलप्रदम् ।

सर्वमङ्गलनिघ्नं च सर्वसंफक्करं परम् ॥

हरिभक्तिप्रदं शश्वत्सुखदं मोक्षदं भवेत् ।

तत्त्वज्ञानप्रदं दारपुत्रपौत्रविवर्धनम् ॥

( ब्रह्मवैवर्त०, आनन्दाश्रम०, ब्रह्मखण्ड, १।७-९ )

यथा पापानि पूयन्ते गङ्गावारिविगाहनात् ।

तथा पुराणश्रवणाद् दुरितानां विनाशनम् ॥

( वामनपुराण, वैकुण्ठेश्वर० ९५।८६ )

"How very strongly even to the present day the Hindus believe in the sanctity of the Purāṇas is best shown by a lecture delivered by Manilal N. Drivedi at the Congress of Orientalists in Stockholm (1889). As a man of Western education he spoke of anthropology and geology, of Darwin and Haeckel, Spencer and Quatrefages, but only in order to prove that the view of life of the Purāṇas and their teachings upon the creation are scientific truths, and he finds in them altogether only the highest truth and deepest wisdom—if one only understands it all correctly, i. e. symbolically."

(Winternity, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 529).

The Purāṇas shed a flood of light on the development of religious beliefs and practices in medieval and modern India."

(P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I, p. 162).

( आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त )

# THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE OF THE UTTARA-KHAṆḌA OF THE PADMA-PURĀṆA

By

ASOKE CHATTERJEE

[ पद्मपुराणस्य सर्वेष्वपि मुद्रितसंस्करणेषु प्राचीनकोशेषु चोत्तरखण्ड-  
मेवास्य पुराणस्यान्तिमं खण्डम् । एतत् खण्डं पद्मपुराणस्य सर्वेष्वपि  
खण्डेषु बृहत्तमं विभिन्नविषयकं च वर्तते । अत्र तीर्थानां, व्रतानां, गीता-  
भागवतादिप्रसिद्धधार्मिकग्रन्थानां माहात्म्यस्य च रोचकं वर्णनमुपलभ्यते ।  
आनन्दाश्रमसंस्करणेऽस्मिन् खण्डे २८२ अध्यायाः, वंगवासिप्रसंसंस्करणे  
वैकटेश्वरप्रसंसंस्करणे च २५५ अध्यायाः सन्ति । समग्रे पद्मपुराणे तु ६२८  
अध्याया एव ( आनन्दाश्रम० ) । एवं पद्मपुराणस्य तृतीयोऽंश इदमुत्तरं  
खण्डम् । अस्य खण्डस्यैतावद् बृहत्परिमाणं तु न प्राचीनकालीनं, यतः  
पद्मपुराणस्य त्रिषु प्राचीन-वंगभाषाकोशेषु केवलं १७४ अध्याया एवास्मिन्  
खण्डे विद्यन्ते । अतोऽनेके विषयाः पश्चात्कालेऽत्र संयोजिता इति स्पष्टं  
प्रतीयते । तैरेव पश्चात्प्रक्षेपितैर्विषयैरस्य खण्डस्य कलेवरं एतावती वृद्धि-  
मुपागतम् ।

अस्मिन् खण्डे प्रोक्ता बहवो विषया नास्य प्रधान-विषयेण सह संगताः,  
न चापि तेऽस्य पूर्वैरुत्तरैर्वा विषयैः सहान्विताः । बहून्वस्योपाख्यानानि  
पूर्वखण्डोक्तोपाख्यानानां पुनरावृत्तिमात्रमेव, न केवलमिदम्, अपि त्वस्मिन्ने-  
वोत्तरखण्डे प्रथममुक्तस्य जलंधरोपाख्यानस्य पुनरावृत्तिर्वर्तते । प्रथमं  
जलंधरोपाख्यानं त्वस्य खण्डस्य ३-१९ अध्यायेषु, द्वितीयं च ततो लघुतरं  
९८-१०६ अध्यायेषु वर्तते ( आनन्दाश्रम० ) । अनयोः प्रथममाख्यानं तु  
वंगभाषाकोशेषु नोपलभ्यते, द्वितीयमेव तत्र प्राप्यते । जलंधरोपाख्यानमिदं  
शिवमहिमख्यापनपरं, शिव एव जलंधरवधे समर्थो बभूव नाम्न्यः कोऽपि देव  
इति प्रदर्शितत्वात् । अथ लघुतरं जलंधरोपाख्यानं तु शिवस्य न तादृशमधिकं  
महिमानं प्रतिपादयति यथा प्रथममुपाख्यानम् । अतो लघुतरमिदमुपाख्यानं  
पश्चाद् वैष्णवैरत्र संयोजितं शिवमहिम्नो लाभवीकरणार्थमित्यनुमीयते ।

अस्योत्तरखण्डस्य रचनाकालविषयेऽपि विदुषा लेखकेन सयुक्तकमनुमानं  
प्रदर्शितम् । वर्तमानेऽस्मिन्नुत्तरखण्डे भागवतपुराणस्य माहात्म्यमुक्तं,  
कूर्मपुराणस्य तामस ( शैव ) पुराणत्वं कथितं, बुद्धावतारस्योल्लेखोऽपि कृतः,  
तथा श्रीशंकराचार्यस्य मायावादविषयकसिद्धान्तानां परिचयोऽप्यत्र प्राप्यते—

इत्यादिभिः कारणैरनुमीयते यदस्य खण्डस्य रचनाकालः १०००-१२०० ई०  
भवितुमर्हतीति । ]

The Uttara-khaṇḍa of the Padma-p. undisputedly occupies the last place in the different recensions of it. The very name 'uttara' suggests that it is the concluding part, and in all the four printed editions (viz., Anss. ed., Venkaṭ. ed., Vāṅga ed. and Kedāranātha Bhaktibinoda's ed.), the Padma-p. ends with it.

The Uttara-khaṇḍa in its present form is the most voluminous khaṇḍa of the Padma-p. and it has dealt with various subject-matters. There are several chapters in this khaṇḍa which are widely divergent in nature from one another. As for example it may be stated that it deals with the glorification of different vratas, of different holy places, of different sacred books like the Bhāgavata, Bhagavadgītā etc., of different incarnations of Viṣṇu, and in the same breath also gives out the story of king Dilīpa and his wife Sudakṣiṇā—how they were granted a son. In fact, in the Anss. edition, we find that this khaṇḍa possesses 282 chapters.<sup>1</sup> The total number of chapters of the Padma p according to the Anss. ed. is 628. Thus, among 48452 verses which constitute the whole of the Padma-p. the Uttara-khaṇḍa alone contains 16779 verses, i. e. it is more than one third of the whole of the Padma-p. in its present form.

But, unfortunately, its importance has not grown up along with its size. There is not even a single chapter which may be considered as full of historic interest. Its importance being less, it is really very difficult to hold patience in carefully searching the whole of it and no blame can be given if one really becomes impatient in going over this long and dull book.

The fact cannot be denied that the present-day Uttara-khaṇḍa of the Padma p. was not so voluminous in its origin. The Purāṇa-writers knew the psychology of the common people and were aware of the fact that their works would be the main

---

1. The Vāṅga. ed. has got 275 chapters and the Venkaṭ. ed. also possesses the same number of chapters.



channels for propagating their views. It does not seem plausible that the Purāṇa-writers who were very much self-conscious would put forward such an uninteresting, dull work which any man would be unwilling to read, causing great hamper to their interest thereby.

There is a serious factor considering which the conclusion becomes irresistible that this khaṇḍa was originally not so voluminous in size. As days passed by, many independent mātmyas or glorifications of different sectarian interests, which had fundamentally no connection with this khaṇḍa began to be incorporated to it and later on these individual treatises came to be regarded as part and parcel of this Khaṇḍa. In fact these treatises now form one or several chapters of it although their independent existence is not rare. It may not be argued that those formed a part of the original Uttara khaṇḍa and as these became popular they were independently preserved by individuals and so this is the cause of their independent existence in a great number. The argument may hold good in case of others but it does not stand here. For the way in which these were used in the Uttara-khaṇḍa is neither natural nor right. While going through these, it is easy to detect the superfluousness of their characters. It is not very difficult for one to understand that these have neither any bearing on the original theme of the Uttara-khaṇḍa nor there is any logical connection between them and main trend of thought of the Uttara-khaṇḍa. The Bhāgavata-mātmya (chs. 189-194); Gitā-mātmya (chs. 171-183); Māgha-mātmya (chs. 219-250) and others clearly show that with previous chapters or with the chapters that followed them they had hardly any serious connection. The number of such treatises is no mean and deserves considerable attention of the scholars. We are aware of about a dozen of such treatises, the subject-matter of which corresponds with that of some chapters of the Uttara-khaṇḍa or which corresponds with such chapters of it in toto; i. e. one is the mere repetition of the other. We give below the names of such treatises :—

1. Gītāmāhātmya.<sup>1</sup>2. Bhāgavatamāhātmya<sup>2</sup>

2. (i) H. P. Shastri, 'Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government collection under the care of the Asiatic Society', (hereinafter referred to as Shastri Cat.), vol. 5, No. 4659.

(ii) Weber, 'Verzeichnisse der Sanskrit-und Prakrit Handschriften' Berlin 1836 (hereinafter referred to as Berlin Cat.) No. 1529.

(iii) Cat. of Sans. Mss. in the Sanskrit College Library, Banares (hereinafter referred to as Benares Cat.) No. 80, p. 243.

(iv) List of Sans. Jaina and Hindi Mss. purchased by order of the government and deposited in the Sanskrit College, Benares, during 1897-1901 (hereinafter referred to as Benares List). No. 189, p. 57.

(v) Do. during the year 1909-10, No. 1907, p. 10.

(vi) Detailed Report of Operations in Search of Sanskrit Mss. in the Bombay Circle, August 1882—March 1883 (hereinafter referred to as Peterson Report) No. 53, p. 115.

(vii) Peharist Sanskritake Pustakonka, (hereinafter referred to as phesh) 5

(viii) Böhlers Cat. 2, 42.

(ix) Catalogue of Sans. Mss. in Private Libraries of the N. W. Provinces Pt. I, (hereinafter referred to as N. W. Cat.) Benares 1874, 8.

(x) Catalogue of Sans. Mss. in Mysore & Coorg, by Lewis Rice, Bangalore 1884 (hereinafter referred to as Rice Cat.) 81, 86.

(xi) Notices of Sans. Mss. by R. L. Mitra (hereinafter referred to as Mitra Notices), No. 2971.

(xii) Collection of Mss. belonging to the late Pandit Radhakrishna of Lahore (hereinafter referred to as Radh) 5.

(xiii) Classified Index to the Sans. Mss. in the Palace at Tanjore by A. C. Burnell (hereinafter referred to as Burnell Index) 185 b.

(xiv) List of Sans. Mss. in Private Libraries of South India by G. Oppert (hereinafter referred to as Opp. Cat.) Vol. I, 1698, Vol. II. 4097, 4780.

3. (i) Shastri Cat. No. G. 10909.

(ii) Benares Cat. Nos. 25, 14 and 34, pp. 238 and 239 respectively.

(iii) Benares List, No. 776, p. 185.

(iv) Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. contained in the Private Libraries of Gujrat, Kathiavad, Kacch, Sindh and Khandes—Bühler Bombay 1872 (hereinafter referred to as Bühler Cat.), no 56, p. 46.

(v) Peterson—Second Report during April 1883-March 1884 No. 29, p. 2.

(vi) Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. in the Library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College, ed. by Hrishikesa Shastri & Siva Chandra Gui, Vol. IV, Calcutta 1902, (hereinafter referred to as Shastri & Gui Cat.), No. 45, p. 38.

(vii) Catalogue of the Sanskrit Mss. in the Punjab University Library, Vol. II, 1941 (hereinafter referred to as P.U. Cat.), Nos. 2249-50, p. 155.

(viii) Catalogue of the Sanskrit Mss. in the Bodleian Library, Vol. II,

3. Māghamāhātmya<sup>4</sup>;

4. Kārttika-māhātmya<sup>5</sup>;

M. Winternitz & Keith, Oxford, 1905, (hereinafter referred to as Bodleian Cat.) p. 147.

(ix) Cat. of Sans. Mss. existing in the Central Provinces, Kielhorn, 30.

(x) Pheh, 4.

(xi) Radh, 40

(xii) N. W. Cat., 446, 172, 482.

(xiii) Opp. Cat. 2927, Vol. 11, 5448

(xv) Report on the search for Sans. Mss. in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1882-83 by R. G. Bhandarkar, Bombay 1884, 55 (hereinafter referred to as Bhandarkar report).

(xvi) India Office Cat. 1116.

4. (i) Shastri Cat. Nos. G. 5705 and 2921.

(ii) Catalogue of Sans. Mss. of Jammu & Kashmere (hereinafter referred to as J. R. K. Cat.), Nos. 3867, 3853, 3740.

(iii) Weber, Berlin Cat., No. 457.

(v) Benares List, during the year 1906, No. 1554, p. 3.

(v) Reports on Sanskrit Mss. in Southern India, by E. Hultzsch, No. 2, Madras 1896, No. 1120, p. 88.

(vi) Ibid, Vol. I, Madras 1895, Nos. 32 and 37, pp. 4 and 6 respectively.

(vii) Rice, Cat. No. 814, pp. 88-89.

(viii) Shastri and Gui, Cat., No. 46, p. 40.

(ix) Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. existing in Oudh for the year 1888, (hereinafter referred to as Oudh Cat.) Nos. 43-44, p. 42.

(x) P. U. Cat., Nos. 2261-2267, p. 156.

(xi) Bodleian Cat., p. 147.

(xii) Ind. Off. Cat. 113.

(xiii) Verzeichniss der Sanskrit-Handschriften (der königlichen Bibliothek in Berlin), Berlin 1863, p. 131

(xiv) Bühler, Cat. 2, 48.

(xv) Burnell, Index 188b, 203b.

(xvi) Report on 122 Mss. by R. G. Bhandarkar, Bombay, 1880, 17

(xvii) Bhandarkar, Report 1881-82, 15.

(xviii) Catalogue of Sans. Mss. in the Library of the Deccan College-Poona. Pt. I, by Kielhorn, Pt. II by R. G. Bhandarkar, (hereinafter referred to as Poona Cat.) 870, 487.

(xix) A Catalogue raisonnée of Oriental Mss. in the library of the (late) Saint George, by William Taylor, Vol. I, Madras, 1857, 59. 157-159, 162, 293.

5. (i) Shastri Cat., No. G. 9597.

(ii) J. & K. Cat., Nos. 3750 and 3742.

(iii) Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. existing in Central Provinces, ed. by F. Kielhorn. Nagpur 1874, No. 14, p. 22.

(iv) Benares List, No. 91, p. 27

5. Vishṇu-sahasra-nāma-stotra<sup>6</sup> ;
6. Ūrddhva-puṇḍra-māhātmya<sup>7</sup> ;
7. Bhīmaikādaśy-upākhyānam ;
8. Jalamdhāropākhyānam<sup>8</sup> ;
9. Vaśīṣṭha-dīlīpa-saṁvāda<sup>9</sup>
10. Prameya-ratnāvalī<sup>10</sup>

(v) Bühler Cat., No. 12, p. 38

(vi) Report on search of Sanskrit Mss. in Bombay Presidency during the year 1882-1883, by R. G. Bhandarkar, (hereinafter referred to as Bhandarkar Report) No. 81, p. 57.

(vii) Shastri & Gui Cat., No. 12, pp. 9-10 & No. 278, p. 167.

(viii) Oudh Cat., No. 42, p. 43

(ix) P. U. Cat., Nos. 2173-88, pp. 150-151.

(x) Catalogue of South Indian Mss. (especially those of the Whish Collection) belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. M. Winternitz, London, 1902. No. 47. Whish No. 480, p. 54.

(xi) Tanjore Catalogue, Vol. XV, P. P. 8 Shastri No. 9597.

(xii) Pheh, 4

(xiii) Radh. 39

(xiv) Burnell, Index, 188b.

(xv) Bhandarkar Report 1881-82, 15.

(xvi) Poona, Cat., Vol. I, 347. Vol. II, 104

(xvii) Opp. Cat. 1875, 2791, 3603, 6881.

6. (i) Shastri, Cat., Nos. G. 2462 and G. 3504.

(ii) Weber, 'Berlin Cat.' No. 454.

(iii) Peterson Report, No. 53, p. 115 (with commentary)

(iv) Bhandarkar Report, No. 79, p. 61, N.B. The name of the Ms. is Vishṇu-Vṛiddha-sahasra-nāma-stotra.

(v) Oudh Cat. for the year 1887, No. 5, p. 36.

(vi) P. U. Cat., No. 2-76, p. 187 (with a commentary)

We have mentioned a few. For a detailed list of the Mss. see Aufrecht Catalogus Catalogorum, p. 593.

7. (i) Tanjore Cat. Vol. XV, ed. P. P. 8, Shastri, No. 9589.

Mention of a Ms. of the same name is found in the Cat. of Sans. Mss. in private libraries of the North West Provinces, Part I, 118, but that is a work of one Giradh Gogva. See Aufrecht, Op. Cit. p. 118. Aufrecht does not mention any of the Mss. of the same name.

8. (i) J. & K. Cat. No. 3955.

(ii) Bodleian Cat. P. 3456, No. 807.

9. (i) Shastri, Cat. No. G. 4839, No Ms. of this name is found in Catalogus Catalogorum.

10. (i) H. P. Shastri, Notices of Sanskrit manuscripts, Vol. I, No. 232.

11. Padma-purāṇa-sūchikā<sup>11</sup>

12. Kamalālaya-māhātmya<sup>12</sup>

These treatises which claim to be the parts of this Uttara-khaṇḍa were independent and had no connection with this khaṇḍa. But as times passed, these treatises in order to garb themselves in antiquity and authenticity came to be regarded as parts of it.

There is further evidence to strengthen our view. The evidence of the Bengal Manuscripts should be taken into consideration. We have examined five Bengali manuscripts of the Uttara khaṇḍa. These are all written in Bengali script. The contents of these Mss. differ in a considerable way with that of the printed text; all the Mss. of this khaṇḍa are comparatively small in size and are not so bulky. None of these Mss. possesses so much contents as are found in the printed texts. It may be stated for example that while the printed edition contains 282 chapters, Aufrecht in his Bodelian Catalogue gives information of a manuscript of the Uttara-khaṇḍa which has 174 chapters only. Ms. No. G. 4416 of the Asiatic Society Calcutta has 173 chapters and Ms. No. 1624 of the Dacca University possesses 174 chapters. Other two Bengal Mss. of the Uttara-khaṇḍa, No. G. 4493 of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta and No. 1429 (kha) belonging to the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Parishat, Calcutta are, however, incomplete and possess only seventeen and sixty-two chapters respectively. In the former the eighteenth chapter is incomplete; but omitting these two, even if we take into consideration the above three Mss., it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Uttara khaṇḍa was originally not so much voluminous.

---

(ii) Oudh, Cat XV, 128.

There are some verses which occur in the Bengal Mss. of the Padma p.

11. (i) Descriptive Catalogue of Sans. Mss. in the Government Oriental Library Madras, Vol. 1V, pt. 1, No. 2138. No such Ms. is found in Catalogue Catalogorum.

12. (i) Tanjore Catalogue, Vol. XV, P.P.S. Shastri, No. 9596.

(ii) Burnell, Index, 188b.

That some portion has been added later is further proved by R. C. Hazra who has examined a manuscript of *Yathārthamañjarī*<sup>13</sup> and in the marginal notes of it has found references to such remarks as undoubtedly proves the superfluousness of at least some of the chapters of the Uttara khaṇḍa.<sup>14</sup>

The spuriousness of some portion of the Uttara-khaṇḍa of the Padma-p. can be proved by the internal evidence also. In some cases it is the exact repetition of a part of some other khaṇḍa.<sup>15</sup> It may be shown in this connection that the story of conflict between Daśaratha and Śani (see Uttara khaṇḍa, ch. 34) occurs already in the Pātāla-khaṇḍa Mss. of Bengal recension.<sup>16</sup> The most curious thing is this that one single story has been twice dealt with in the same Uttara-khaṇḍa in different places which definitely proves that one of them is surely later. The reason for introducing a particular story for the second time will be explained later; but is this not strong enough to convince us that atleast some portion of the Uttara-khaṇḍa has been written later and added to it? Thus it grew larger and larger and at last it took this present shape. We are referring to the story of Jalandhara i. e. Jalandharopākhyāna. The first begins from chapters 3 and is stretched upto ch. 19, while the other ends in ch. 106 beginning from ch. 98. The first version of this story is a larger one and is conspicuous by its absence in the Bengal Mss. which possess the shorter version of this story. The argument that one has been added to supplement the other does not hold good as the story in both the places is independent and complete. The self-sufficiency and completeness of the

13. For the description of the manuscript see Hazra; *Purāṇa Records*; p. 126, f. n. 28.

14. See Hazra, 'Ibid', p. 126. For the lines written in the marginal space of the *Yathārthamañjarī*, see *Ibid.*, p. 126, f. n. 99.

15. Compare Utt. kh. 243. 3-42=Ādi. Kh. 30. 1-41; Utt. kh. 243. 43-96b=Ādi 31. 1-53; Utt. kh. 244. 87-88a=Ādi 31. 54-74; Utt. kh. 245. 1-146=Ādi. 31. 75-209. Thus the whole of the chapters 30 and 31 of the Ādi Khaṇḍa have been practically and literally followed in the chapters 243-245 of the Uttarakhaṇḍa.

16. See Ms. No. G. 1416A i. e. Pātāla-khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa belonging to the Asiatic Society, Calcutta ch. 11. fol. 22.

story may be shown by giving in a nutshell the sum and substance of the story.

Jalandhara was born from the fire of the forehead of Mahādeva who threw this fire on the sea. At the request of the sea, Brahmā taught him all the śāstras and astras<sup>17</sup> and installed him as the King.<sup>18</sup> Jalandhara married Vṛindā, the daughter of Kālanemi. In order to punish Indra, Jalandhara, the king of the daityas with all of his force attacked the heaven. Many lives were lost in this battle ; but Śukrāchārya, the priest and minister of Jalandhara, revived them by his power named 'mṛitasañjivani' (giving life to the dead persons); Bṛihaspati, the minister of the gods, was also reviving the dead soldiers of the heaven by herbs brought from the Droṇa mountain but as Jalandhara took that mountain up and hurdled it down to the deep depth of the sea<sup>19</sup>, Bṛihaspati could not now revive the dead gods and finally the gods were defeated. Jalandhara occupied the throne of the heaven. Being entreated by the defeated gods Viṣṇu himself fought with Jalandhara but in vain and seeing his prowess Viṣṇu was pleased at heart and at his request agreed to live with Lakṣmī in his domain. Now being ill advised by Nārada, the demon king cast his lustful eye on Pārvatī, the female consort of Śiva and thereby caused displeasure of the latter who in order to punish the demon-king, began to fight with Jalandhara. All the gods contributed the best of their energy and thence was created the Sudarśana Chakra which was used by Śiva in this battle. In the meantime the demon-king by his Māyā assumed the shape of Śaṅkara and wanted to hoodwink Pārvatī but did not become successful ; on the other hand, Viṣṇu assuming the form of Jalandhara, easily deceived Vṛindā, the wife of Jalandhara. However, after a great battle with Śiva and all His Pramathas, Jalandhara

---

17. Uttara-khaṇḍa, 98. 28a. sarvaśāstrāstra-pāragāḥ

18. Ibid. 99. 29a. 'ity-uktvā śukramahūya rājye taṁ chābhyashechayat'

19. ity-uktaḥ sa tu daityendro nītvā droṇachalaṁ tadā  
prākshipat sāgare tūrṇaṁ punarīyaṁ-mahābhavam

Ibid., 99. 25.

was killed at last by Śaṅkara with the Sudarśana. The energy of Jalandhara was immersed into Śaṅkara.<sup>20</sup>

Thus we see that it is a completely independent episode. Here we have outlined the summary of the shorter version but it should be remembered that the theme in both the version is the same. Let us try to show very briefly the salient features of distinction between the two.

There are differences between the two as regards the origin and birth of Kīrtimukha. In the longer version it has been said that he was born from the matted locks of Maheśvara<sup>21</sup> whereas in the shorter one it has been said that he took his birth from the midst of the eye-brows of Maheśvara.<sup>22</sup> From the longer version we know that kīrtimukha from its very birth became very much hungry. Śaṅkara asked him to devour the corpse in the battle-field, but seeing no war he was about to swallow Brahmā finding none, when he was prevented by Śiva from doing so. Being pained in acute hunger, Kīrtimukha began to eat his own limbs, but Śiva prevented him this time also.<sup>23</sup>

But in the shorter version the story is slightly different. As soon as Kīrtimukha was born, he began to eat Rāhu, the messenger of Jalandhara. Rāhu, the messenger cried for help and Mahādeva ordered Kīrtimukha to release Rāhu and asked him to eat his own body.<sup>24</sup>

Besides these, the longer version has got very elaborate discussions. The shorter one totally omits the substance of the fourth chapter. Moreover most of the subject matter of the 6th to 8th chapters is not found in the shorter version. Description of war between the Devas and the Dānavas has been made only in a very few lines although it takes a considerable part in the longer one. Only the brief substance of a few lines of the 8th

---

20. Ibid., 106-13b.

21. Ibid., 11-36b-37.

22. Ibid., 101-21-22.

23. Ibid., 11-39-41.

24. Ibid., 101-24-30.



chapter where reference to the Drona mountain has been made is found in the shorter form. Thus there are minor points of distinction where these two versions do not agree, but in spite of that it cannot be denied that the main theme between the two is the same.

We will now direct our attention to throw light on the fact, i. e. which of the two is the earlier and why and by whom the later version has been added. It is rather an intriguing question and seems impossible to be scientifically explained. We offer below our humble opinion.

What is the main theme of the Jalandhara episode? We think that preliminarily this episode proclaims the glorifications of Śiva. This is proved by the fact that it is Śiva only who has succeeded in killing Jalandhara while all other gods including Viṣṇu failed. From this it can be safely presumed that it must have been the contribution of the Śaivas. But on a critical observation it will be seen, however, that the shorter version of this story is a contribution of the Vaiṣṇavas who have introduced this and added later. They have made so in order to wipe away the Śaiva influence to some extent by denouncing Him or rather by curtailing a good deal of His glorifications. That a creature, produced from Śiva will be able to overpower Brahmā was perhaps too much for the non-Śaiva sect. They, principally the Vaiṣṇavas, could not bear so much the māhātmya of Śiva and hence omitted such things. Moreover, they tried to minimise the glory of Śiva by associating Him with a dirty affair as we see in the shorter version, it is He who orders Kīrtimukha to do an inhuman work i. e. to devour his own body, whereas as has been pointed before, in the longer version He just like a noble Lord prevented His man from doing such a criminal and reprehensible act.

In this way we can say that the shorter version has perhaps been added later by the Vaiṣṇavas and the two versions of the story went side by side and later on when the Uttara-khaṇḍa was on the verge of taking the present shape both the

stories have been preseved, for in the meantime both the versions gained so much wide popularity that it was not possible to drop one of them.

Thus it has been pointed out that the Uttara-khaṇḍa in its present form is the outcome of the contribution of the different sects at different periods. So it is clear that not to a particular period of time it can be ascribed. It can be safely remarked that there is not even a single chapter which bears the stamp of an early age. On the other hand, examples of late age can easily be detected.

We should discuss now the question of the actual date of this work in its present form. One of its passage reads as follows :

bhāgavatam śṛiṇute yastu purāṇam cha paṭhen-narah/  
pratyakṣharam bhavet tasya kapilādānaṁ phalam<sup>25</sup>//

This shows its acquaintance with the Bhāgavata-purāṇa.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, some chapters beginning from 190 of this khaṇḍa describe the glorification of this Bhāgavata-p. Thus it is absolutely sure that this Purāṇa was not only known to the writer of this Uttara-khaṇḍa but at that time it obtained so much popularity as had been glorified in the other Purāṇa. This khaṇḍa was acquainted with the Śaiva characteristics of the Karma-p. The following lines may be quoted in this connection :

mātsyam kaurmam tathā laiṅgam śaivam skādam  
tathaiva cha //  
āgneyam cha śaḍetāni tāmasāni nibodha me<sup>27</sup> /

---

25. Uttara-khaṇḍa, 63, 55

26. There are differences of opinion as regards the exact date of the Bhāgavata-p. Vaidya, (J.B. Br. R.A.S., 1925, p. 144 ft.), Bhandarkar (Vaishnavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems, p. 49), Fargiter, (Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 80), Farquhar, (Outline of the Religious Literature of India, p. 232) Winternitz (History of Indian Literature, vol. I, p. 556) place it in C. 900 A.D. Wilson, Macdonell, Colebrooke and Burnouf ascribe 13th century as its date. According to R.C. Hazra the time of composition of the Bhāgavata-p. is the former half of the sixth century A. D. (R. C. Hazra, op. cit. p. 55).

27. Uttara-khaṇḍa, 263. 81b-82a.



cular work to attain such popularity as can be translated into a local language. Thus the upper limit can be determined as the thirteenth century. Vāchaspatimiśra, Govindānanda, Raghunandan, Gopālabhaṭṭa, and Vijñānabhikṣu have quoted verses from this khaṇḍa.<sup>33</sup>

The authors of Prāṇatoshapītantra also quote a number of verses from this khaṇḍa<sup>34</sup>, but this work comes of a very recent date so it should not be given any importance.

In this way we see that the time cannot further be pushed up. The fact that the summary of this khaṇḍa as given in the Nāṇadiya-p. I. 93. is much alike to that of the printed texts, also tends to strengthen our view i. e. it was composed sometime between 1000 and 1200. A. D.

---

32. P. T. Raju, 'The Indian literatures No. XV, Telegu Literature (Andhra Literature)', P. E. N. Book, p. 28.

33. For the list of the traced verses see R. C. Hazra, op. cit., pp. 312-313.

34. A list of the verses of Prāṇatoshapītantra that can be traced in the Uttara Khaṇḍa is given below :

Prāṇatoshapī (Vasūmati ed.)	Uttarakhaṇḍa	Prāṇatoshapī	Uttarakhaṇḍa
p. 181	= 253.11-13	p. 358	= 245.53-54
p. 181	= 253.14	p. 358	= 245.80
p. 181	= 253.40		
p. 181	= 253.43a		
p. 182	= 253.35-38		
p. 183	= 253.45-48a		
p. 338	= 244.30-31		
p. 347	= 245.46-51		
(last 2 lines do not occur in the Uttarakhaṇḍa)	(verses 48 & 50 do not occur in the prāṇatoshapī)		

## पुराण-सुभाषितानि

( हरिवंशपुराणम्, चित्रशालाप्रेस-पूना-संस्करणम् )

हरिवंशपर्वः अध्यायः श्लोकाङ्काः

१. योगो हि दुर्लभो नित्यमल्पप्रज्ञैः कदाचन ।  
लब्ध्वापि नाशयन्त्येनं व्यसनैः कटुतामिताः ॥ „ १९ १०
२. शरणागतः क्षुधार्तश्च शत्रुमिश्राप्युपद्रुतः ।  
चिरोषितश्च स्वगृहे पातव्यः सर्वदा भवेत् ॥ „ २० ११
३. कुमित्रं च कुदेशं च कुराजानं कुसौहृदम् ।  
कुपुत्रं च कुभार्यां च दूरतः परिवर्जयेत् ॥ „ २० ११९
४. अपकारिणि विस्त्रम्भं यः करोति नराधमः ।  
अनाथो दुर्बलो यद्वन्न चिरं स तु जीवति ॥ „ २० १२२
५. न विश्वसेदविश्वस्ते विश्वस्ते नातिविश्वसेत् ।  
विश्वासाद्भयमुत्पन्नं मूलान्यपि निवृन्तति ॥ „ २० १२३
६. राजसेविषु विश्वासं गर्भसंकरितेषु च ।  
यः करोति नरो मूढो न चिरं स तु जीवति ॥ „ २० १२४
७. अपि मार्दवभावेन गात्रं संलीय बुद्धिमान् ।  
अरिं नाशयते नित्यं यथा बल्लिर्महाद्रुमम् ॥ „ २० १२६
८. शत्रुशेषमृणच्छेषं शेषमग्नेश्च भूमिप ।  
पुनर्वर्धेत संभूय तस्माच्छेषं न शेषयेत् ॥ „ २० १३१
९. हसते जल्पते वैरी एकपात्रे भुनक्ति च ।  
एकासनं चारोहति स्मरते तच्च कित्विषम् ॥ „ २० १३२
१०. निधाय मनसा वैरं प्रियं वक्तीह यो नरः ।  
उपसर्पेन्न तं प्राज्ञः कुरङ्ग इव लुब्धकम् ॥ „ २० १३४
११. न चासन्ने निवस्तव्यं सवैरे वर्धिते रिपौ ।  
पातयेत्तं समूलं हि नदीरय इव द्रुमम् ॥ „ २० १३५

हरिवंशपर्वः अध्यायः श्लोकाङ्काः

१२. अमित्रादुन्नतिं प्राप्य नोन्नतोऽस्मीति विश्वसेत् ।  
तस्मात्प्राप्योन्नतिं नश्येत् प्रावार इव क्रीटकः ॥      ,,      २०      १३६
१३. न जातु कामः कामानामुपभोगेन शाम्यति ।  
हविषा कृष्णवर्त्मैव भूय एवाभिवर्धते ॥      ,,      ३०      ३८
१४. जीर्यन्ति जीर्यतः केशा दन्ता जीर्यन्ति जीर्यतः ।  
जीविताशा धनाशा च जीर्यतोऽपि न जीर्यति ॥      ,,      ३०      ४३
१५. ब्रह्मचर्ये स्थितं धैर्यं ब्रह्मचर्ये स्थितं तपः ।  
ये स्थिता ब्रह्मचर्येषु ब्राह्मणास्ते दिवि स्थिताः ॥      ,,      ४५      ३८
१६. ब्रह्मचर्याद्ब्राह्मणस्य ब्राह्मणत्वं विधीयते ।  
एवमाहुः परे लोके ब्रह्म ब्रह्मविदो जनाः ॥      ,,      ४५      ३७
१७. नास्ति योगं विना सिद्धिर्नास्ति सिद्धिं विना यशः ।  
नास्ति लोके यशोमूलं ब्रह्मचर्यात्परं तपः ॥      ,,      ४५      ३९
१८. अन्नजा भुवि मर्त्यानां श्रमजा वा कथंचन ।  
तैषा भवति लोकस्य निद्रा सर्वस्य लौकिकी ॥      ,,      ५०      ३०
१९. धर्मे प्रयतमानानां मानवानां कुतो भयम् ।  
२०. सत्ये धर्मे च नियतान्मानवान् विगतज्वरान् ।  
नाकाले घर्मिणो मृत्युः शक्नोति प्रसमीक्षितुम् ॥      ,,      ५१      ४
२१. जेतव्यानीन्द्रियाण्यादौ तज्जये हि ध्रुवो जयः ।  
२२. न चास्मात्त्रेण दुष्यन्ति साधवः सत्यथे स्थिताः ॥      ,,      ५४      ३०
२३. विद्यया यो यया युक्तस्तस्य सा दैवतं परम् ।  
सैव पूज्याऽर्चनीया च सैव तस्योपकारिणी ॥      ,,      १६      ४
२४. न चात्मनो गुणांस्तात प्रवदन्ति मनीषिणः ।  
परेणोक्ता गुणा गौण्यं यान्ति वेदार्थसंमिताः ॥      ,,      २३      ८
२५. मान्याश्चैवाभिगम्याश्च वृद्धास्तात यथाग्रयः ।  
क्रोधो हि तेषां प्रदहेल्लोकानन्तर्गतानपि ॥      ,,      २३      १२

विष्णुपर्वः अध्यायः श्लोकाङ्काः

	विष्णुपर्वः अध्यायः श्लोकाङ्काः	
२६. धर्मस्य गतिरन्वेष्ट्या मत्स्यस्य गतिरप्स्विव ।	२३	१३
२७. दारुणे च पिता पुत्रे नैव दारुणतां व्रजेत् ।	२३	१६
२८. पुत्राप्नो नरकात्पुत्रो यस्मात् त्राता पितृस्तदा । तस्माद् ब्रुवन्ति पुत्रेति पुत्रं धर्मविदो जनाः ॥	२३	२०
२९. दैवं पुरुषकारेण न शक्यमतिवर्त्तितुम् ।	२८	४
३०. स्त्रीणां चारित्र्यलुब्धानां पतिरेकः परा गतिः ।	३१	१४
३१. नाकाले म्रियते कश्चित् प्राप्ते काले न जीवति । एवं विनिश्चयं कृत्वा न कुर्यात् कस्यचिद्भयम् ॥	४९	३४
३२. अनिष्पन्नामपि क्रियां नयोपेतां विचक्षणाः । फलदां हि प्रकुर्वन्ति महासेनापतिर्यथा ॥	५१	२३
३३. पुत्रदारसहस्रैर्हि आताऽनघ विशिष्यते । सद्वृत्तो ज्ञानसम्पन्न इति ब्रह्मा पुराऽब्रवीत् ॥	७०	२६
३४. नास्ति आवृत्तसमो बन्धुराहार्य इतरो जनः ।	७०	२७
३५. अनृते धर्मभग्ने च न शुश्रूषति चाप्रिये । न प्रियं न हितं वाच्यं सद्भिरेवेति निन्दिताः ॥	७१	७
३६. अन्योन्यमेदो आतृणां सुहृदां वा बलान्तक । भवत्यानन्दकृद्देव द्विषतां नात्र संशयः ॥	७१	९
३७. महाप्रभावाः सततं भवन्ति हि सहिष्णवः । श्रोतारश्चैव सततं वृद्धानां ज्ञानचक्षुषाम् ॥	७१	४९
३८. सहसैव तु कार्याणामारम्भो न प्रशस्यते ।	७२	१६
३९. प्रीतिः प्रमाणं न वयः प्रमाणम् ।	८९	८६
४०. यदतीतं पुनर्नैति गतं स्रोत इवाम्भसः ।	९२	१५
४१. धर्मस्तपश्च सत्यं च यत्र तत्र जयो ध्रुवम् ।	९४	४१
४२. नोपेक्षणीयः शत्रुर्वै वध्यतां क्षिप्रमेव वै । उपेक्षित इव व्याधिः शरीरं नाशयेद्ध्रुवम् ॥	१०५	३६-३७
४३. चतुर्थांशं हि धर्मस्य रक्षिता लभते फलम् ।	१११	९

विष्णुपर्वः अध्यायः श्लोकाङ्काः

४४. कुलोपक्रोशनकरी कुलाङ्गारी निराश्रया ।			
जीवितुं न स्पृहेन्नारी साध्वीनामग्रतः स्थिता ॥	„	११८	१५
४५. कालो हि दुरतिक्रमः ।	„	११८	२५
४६. भवेदापत्सु यन्मित्रं तन्मित्रं शस्यते बुधैः ।	„	११८	७८
४७. प्रयत्नो युज्यते कार्येष्विति शास्त्रनिदर्शनम् ।	„	११८	९१

भविष्यपर्वः अध्यायः श्लोकाङ्काः

४८. अनाथा ह्यपराध्यन्ते कुनेतारश्च मानवाः ।	„	२	२३
४९. परिहर्तुं न शक्या हि कालेन विहिता गतिः ।	„	२	२५
५०. लेखा हि काललिखिताः सर्वथा दुरतिक्रमाः ।	„	२	२७
५१. तेजसा व्याहृतं तेजस्तेजस्येवावतिष्ठते ।	„	२	३९
५२. यथा युगानां परिवर्त्तनानि, चिरं प्रवृत्तानि विधिस्वभावात् । क्षणं न सन्तिष्ठति जीवलोकः, क्षयोदयाभ्यां परिवर्त्तमानः ॥	„	४	५३
५३. न हि तद् विद्यते लोके तपसा यज्ञ लभ्यते ।	„	२९	१
५४. हत्वा रिपुगणांस्तुष्टिरनुरागश्च राजसु । हतस्य त्रिदिवे वासो नास्ति युद्धसमा गतिः ॥	„	५९	५९
५५. गृहस्थ एव धर्मात्मा गृहस्थो धर्मवित्तमः । गृहस्थो धर्मरूपस्तु गृहस्थो वर्ण एव च ॥	„	१०७	२२
५६. न हि साधोर्विनाशोऽस्ति लोकयोरुभयोरपि ।	„	१०९	२०

( बीणापाणि पांडे )



# ‘RĀMAṆĪYAKAM’—THE ISLAND OF THE NĀGAS—

By

SADASHIV A. DANGE

[ रामणीयकामिधः कश्चिद् द्वीपविशेषो महोदधौ आसीदिति सुपर्णाध्याये नाम प्राचीनग्रन्थे महाभारते चोक्तम् । तत्र स ‘नागानामालयः’ इत्यप्युच्यते । पणितेन पराजिता विनता कद्रूनाम्न्याः सपत्न्या दासीभावमुपागता, वैनतेयो गृहस्थापि पक्षगानां दासत्वं प्राप्तः । कद्रूचोदिता विनता तां कद्रूं गृहस्थ कद्रूपुत्रान् पक्षगान् समुद्रकुक्षौ स्थितं नागानामालयं रामणीयकं नाम द्वीपविशेष-मूढतुः—इति कथा सुपर्णाध्याये महाभारते पुराणेषु च वर्तते । तद् रामणीयकं नाम स्थानं किं कुत्र चासीदिति विषये नैकमत्यं विदुषाम् । ‘ओल्डम्’ नाम्नः पाश्चात्यविदुषो मतानुसारेणैदं स्थानं मलाबारतटे स्थितमासीत्; ‘हेरस’नामा विद्वान् मित्रदेशस्योत्तरभागेऽवस्थितं ‘अल् रहमानिया’ नामा कश्चिद् ग्राम एव रामणीयकं नाम स्थानमिति मन्यते । अस्मिन् लेखे विदुषा लेखकेन हेरसमतमालोच्य स्वमतं स्थापितम् । ‘बंगालखाड़ी’ नामके महोदधौ स्थितो ‘निकोबार’ नाम द्वीप एव रामणीयकं नाम द्वीपः—इति लेखकस्य मतम् । इदं स्थानं सागराम्बुपरिक्षिप्तमासीदिति महाभारते उक्तम्, जम्बुद्वीपस्य च कर्णस्थानीयो नागद्वीपः—इति चापि महाभारते प्रोक्तम् । अतो नेदं स्थानं मित्रदेशीयो ग्रामो भवितुमर्हति, अपितु निकोबारद्वीप एव नागद्वीपः ( रामणीयकापरनामा ) इति सम्यगनुमीयते । निकोबार = नक्कवरम् ( नक्कपुरम् ) = नागवरम् = नागपुरम् = नागद्वीपः—इति व्युत्पत्त्याऽपि निकोबारद्वीप एव नागद्वीपो रामणीयको वेति लेखकेन प्रदर्शितम् । ]

The mention of *Rāmaṇīyakam* comes in the context of the conflict between Garuḍa and the Nāgas. Kadrū,—the mother of the nāgas—and Vinatā, the mother of Garuḍa, both wives of Kaśyapa, are said to have had a ‘wager’<sup>1</sup> in which Vinatā is defeated and, as a consequence, she becomes the slave of her co-wife Kadrū. Garuḍa—the son of Vinatā also becomes a slave and at the bidding of the nāgas has to carry the latter on his

1. For the motive of the wager cf. Tait. Sam. VI-1-61—Kāṭhaka Sam. XXX-10, where we have “*Ātma-rūpayoh*”; Suparṇādhyaeya—III-5-3” *Svarūpayoh*”, etc.

back to the island of Rāmaṇīyaka.<sup>3</sup> The *Suparṇādhyaṃya* has a clear mention of the place to which the nāgas are to be carried by Garuḍa. Thus we have—

*Samudre Rāmaṇīyakam dvīpam śuśrūma śāśvatam  
nāgānāmālayam pūrvam tatra no vināte naya*<sup>4</sup>

The version of the Mb. and the Purāṇas is the same as that of the Suparṇa-Adhyāya.

Now a question—which exactly was this Rāmaṇīyakam—that is said to be the abode of the nāgas? Oldham thinks Rāmaṇīyakam to be on the Malabar Coast.<sup>4</sup> Father Herace points out the presence of a *village* by name, 'El-Rahmania' in North Egypt.<sup>5</sup> He identifies 'El Rahmania' with *Rāmaṇīyaka*. Father Herace does not give any special reason for this hypothesis of his; nor so does Oldham. Father Heras' hypothesis seems to be particularly dangerous when the account of the Mb. is taken by him to prove that the nāga-Garuḍa motif found in Egypt, has been lent by the Indian nāgas who "*under the leadership of a Garuḍa chief*", according to father Herace; migrated to Egypt. Thus the position of Father Herace is—

- i. 'El Rahmania' is the same as Rāmaṇīyaka spoken of in the Mb.
- ii. The nāgas were carried by Garuḍa to El Rahmania. (Rāmaṇīyaka?) in Egypt.
- iii. This is the cause why in Egypt the nāga-Garuḍa motif is found; and hence Egypt owes this motif to India.
- iv. Garuḍa was the leader of the nāga-expedition to Egypt.

2. In this connection the first ref. to Rāmaṇīyakam is to be found in the 'Suparṇādhyaṃya'—which is followed by the Mahābhārata ('Mb.' henceforth), and the Purāṇas. Cf. Suparṇa Ad.-IV-7-2 (According to Die Suparṇasaga by Jart Charpentier.)

3. For Ref. to Rāmaṇīyakam in the Mb. see I-27-1 (Edi. Nilakantha).

4. Cf. 'The Sun and the Serpent'—(London, 1905) P. 59-60.

5. Cf. 'Studies in Proto-Indo-Mediterranean Culture' (Bombay, 1953) P. 361 ff.

Before seeing which the Rāmaṇīyaka of old is, we shall quickly explode this hypothesis of Herace based on a weak structure. The passage of the Mb. (i.e. 1-26 ff.) upon which the reverent father tries to base his edifice does not in the least support his view. There is not the slightest indication in the said passage to show that Garuḍa was the leader of the nāgas. On the other hand Garuḍa is said to be an antagonist of the nāgas and was, in the context of this particular narration, their slave. Vinatā was the slave of Kadrū and Vinatā's son, Garuḍa, was to carry the nāgas on his back as a slave.<sup>6</sup> In the face of this clear textual mention of Garuḍa's slavery, it seems far from the truth to suppose that the account speaks of the leadership of the nāgas on the part of Garuḍa. It may be noted secondly, that the 'Eagle-serpent' motif was not peculiar to ancient India alone from which place it might be supposed to have travelled all the way to Egypt. The Mexican war-god-(i. e. of the Azetecs, the crude hunting people, who entered Mexico to conquer it)—*Huitzilopochtli* has the beak of an eagle; His head is covered with the feathers of an eagle. On his breast are represented two eagles tearing out a serpent.<sup>7</sup> The creator god of the Mayas of central America was 'Kukulcan'—a combination of snake and eagle. He was a winged serpent.<sup>8</sup> Numerous instances can be quoted to prove that the serpent-eagle motif had a universal appeal<sup>9</sup>, and to suppose that it is India that lent it to Egypt is difficult to be accepted.

- 
6. Cf. I-25-2 "Yatra sū Vinatā tasmin paṇitena parājitā /  
 atīva duḥkhasantaptā dāśibhāvam upagatā ||"  
 and I-25-5—"tataḥ Suparṇamātā tānavahat Sarpamāteram /  
 paṇnagān Garuḍas ebūpi mātṛivachana-choditāḥ ||  
 and also I-27-12 "Sa vicintyābravīt pakṣī māteram Vinatān tada /  
 kiṁ kārṇaṁ mayā mātāḥ kartavyaṁ sarpabhaṣitam ||  
 also Garud says to serpents—  
 "Kimāḥṛitya viditvā vā kiṁ kṛitvā pauruṣam /  
 dāsyād vo vimuchyeyaṁ tatavyaṁ vadata lelihāḥ ||"

7. Cf. 'Ancient Races and Myths'—by Chandra Chakravarty—P. 131 ; also 128.

8. Ibid P. 128 (Kukul = Bird, Can = Snake, i. e. the Snake-bird).

9. For the universal acceptance of the snake-eagle motif, see also—Zimmer—'Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization' (New York-1947)-

Now let us turn to the identification of Rāmaṇīyaka. Father Herace takes Rāmaṇīyaka to be a village in North Egypt. But the Mb. passage on which rests his hypothesis clearly mentions Rāmaṇīyaka to be an island.<sup>10</sup> It is said to be in the midst of the ocean and to a far side.<sup>11</sup> One wonders whether this description holds good in the case of El Rahmania—a village in North Egypt. Herace does not refer to the Suparṇa Adh. that is older than the Mb. which clearly mentions it as an island, as we have already noted.<sup>12</sup> We have also in the same passage Kadrū asking Garuḍa to lead the serpents thence to another island.<sup>13</sup> This shows that there is here a hint of a cluster of islands near one another. There is also an indication of the fact, that though the nāgas that were carried by Garuḍa on his back went to the island Rāmaṇīyaka *for the first time*,<sup>14</sup> *the island was already called the 'island of the nāgas'*, ('Nāgānāmālayam'). If we suppose with Herace that Garuḍa led the nāgas to Egypt and subsequently the Egyptians got the nāga-Garuḍa motif, this goes against the textual account of the Mb. and of the Suparṇa Adhyāya as seen above, which states that the latter nāgas went to the old abode of the nāgas. Thus it can be seen that the possibility of El Rahmania in the North Egypt is ruled out. Herace is equally unconvincing when he interpretes the journey of Garuḍa towards the Sun with serpents on back and the subsequent rain to relieve the serpents from the heat of the sun at the request of Kadrū,<sup>15</sup> to be referring to a real journey of the nāgas under Garuḍa through a desert and the rainfall on the way to Egypt. No proof for this hypothesis has been furnished by Father Herace. How should we believe that

---

Chapter on 'the serpent and the bird'—also-Charles Singer-'From Magic to Science'. (Dover-1958), etc. etc.

10. Cf. Mb. I-27-1 and Nilakaṇṭha thereon.

11. Cf. 'Samudrakukshau-ekānto nāgānāmālayam śubham'.

12. Cf. Ibid. note 3, page 1.

13. I-27-9a. Esp.

'Vahāsmān-āparāṇi dvīpaṇi suramyāṇi vimlodakam'

14. Cf. 'pūrvam āgataḥ'—Mb. I-27-2.

14a. Cf. also Suparṇa Adh.—Ibid p. 1. note 3. 'nāgānam ālayam pūrvam.

15. Mb.-I-25

Garuḍa went to the West? Generally it is the East and not the West that was auspicious to Garuḍa—East, the direction of the rising sun. For he is, at another time, said to actually go to the East where he went to meet the Vāḷakhilyas.<sup>16</sup> The point to be noted is that the description of Garuḍa going towards the sun and the subsequent rain at the request of the mother of the serpent symbolizes the 'Sun-bird' nature of the eagle (Garuḍa), while the serpents are universally accepted to be the bringers of rain and hence propitiated.<sup>17</sup> Hence to suppose a real journey through a desert is not necessary.

It seems all probable that Rāmanīyakam was an island somewhere in the bay of Bengal and might have been the original (or another) name of *Nicobar*, so called because of its beautiful surroundings.

Nicobar in ancient times was called *Nakkavaram* and the same is identified with the ancient Nāgadvīpa.<sup>18</sup> Even etymologically *Nakkavaram* could be 'Nāgapuram'<sup>19</sup> and hence could be the *Nāgadvīpa*. If we remember that the nāgas (serpents) and the 'makaras' (called also 'nakra' whence we get 'Nakka'→'Nāga') are often interchanged<sup>20</sup>, it is easy to understand how *Nakkavaram* (originally *Nakrapuram*?) can be Nāgapuram or the abode of the serpents, that is said to be in the midst of the

16. Sup. Adh.-VII-14-Of. eḥā prācī Garuḍa tāṁ Śrayasva yasyāṁ vaikhāṇasā piśhavo Vāḷakhilyāḥ"

17. Hastings—Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics' under 'Serpent'. P. 401, 418; also Werner 'Myths and Legends of China' (London, 1922) P. 208ff. For the Sun-bird nature of Garuḍa (Eagle) cf. 'Making of Man'. Chapter 'The coming of Warriors', also Zimmer 'Myths and Symbols'....q. b.

18. Cf. R. K. Mukerji 'Ancient India'—(Allahabad-1936) p. 486 and the map opp. to it. See, also Dr. Vasudeva Sharana Agrawal's article in Journal of the Bihar Research Society-part-I—p. 123-137 for the ancient 'dvīpas' of India.

19. For other instances of this type cf. Māyāpuram=Māyāvaram in the South, also Kāñchīpura=Kāñjīvaram, etc.

20. Cf. Werner q. b. p. 202 ff., also Vogel 'Indian Serpent-lore' (London, 1926) p. 27 where he mentions a sculpture at the Gupta Temple of Devagharh wherein the 'Gajendra-Moksha' episode is depicted and in the place of the *Nakra* (crocodile) we have a seven-hooded cobra.

ocean and to a further side from the main-land of ancient India. Nicobar has a further claim to the identification with the ancient Rāmaṇīyakam; for the latter, though said to be the abode of the nāgas, is said to be prepared by Viśvakarman, (according to the same account of the Mb.,) as the abode of Makaras<sup>21</sup>—i. e. the nakras (=nāgas!) and hence could well be the Nāga-island. Hence it could be *Nakrapuram* or the *Nakkavaram*, the present Nicobar. This was already populated by certain nāga clans. True to the description in the Mb., this island Nicobar is surrounded by waters on all sides.<sup>22</sup>

There is another point also. In another place in the Mb, the Jambu-dvīpa (the ancient main land of India) is described as the divine hare with *Tāmrāparṇa* as its tip and having the *Kaśyapa dvīpa* and the *Nāga-dvīpa* for his two ears.<sup>23</sup> *Tāmrāparṇa* is identified as the modern ceylon; and if Ceylon be taken as the tip of the mouth which would comprise of the Southern peninsula, the two ears—i. e. the *Kaśyapa-dvīpa* and the *Nāga-dvīpa* would roughly be the island of Kaccha on one side and the island of Nicobar on the other. The idea in the said passage seems to be to denote two ends of the Jambu-dvīpa proper, and the exact similarity of Nicobar to other place of the ear need not be stressed.

In the context of the Wager between Kadrū and Vinatā the word '*Mahodadhi*' often comes.<sup>24</sup> This '*Mahodadhi*' is said to be the ancient name of the bay of Bengal,<sup>25</sup> in which stands the island of the nāgas and this will suite the modern Nicobar.

Of great interest it will be to note in this context that Mukerji mentions a portion called *Ramannadeśa* in ancient times

21. I-27-2—"tām dvīpaṁ makarāvāsaṁ vibhitaṁ Viśvakarmaṇā".

22. Cf. "Sāgarāmbu-parikṣiptam".

23. Mb.-VI-8-55 and 56.

24. Cf. Mb.-I-22-4; also-I-25-1—"mātur antikam āgachohhat, param pāram mahodadheḥ," and thence they go to the island of the nāgas-which is in the sea. Clearly the Eastern direction and *Nicobar* (the *nakrapura*).

25. See 'Ancient India'—q.b. the map.

extending from Rangoon to Pegu on the West coast of Burma.<sup>26</sup> This name '*Ramannadeśa*' was, according to him, a general name given to the various settlements of the Mons (also known as the Tailangas)—who migrated to Burma. They had a Hindu kingdom in the 6th century A. D. Hence it does not seem improbable that in times before the 6th century A. D., the islands nearing the West coast of Burma—including the Nāga-dvipa—(Nicobar—together with the coast might have been called Rāmaṇīyaka, of which '*Ramanna-deśa*' appears to have been a corrupt form. It could well have been a colony of the nāgas before the Mons arrived there. The island being distinctly spoken of as 'Rāmaṇīyaka' in the Mb. and earlier in the Suparṇa Adh. hints at the fact that Nicobar, the colony of the ancient nāgas, was very rich in natural beauty and hence was primarily called the 'Rāmaṇīyaka'.

---

26. 'Ancient India'—P. 488,

# “पुराणसंशोधने भारतीयराजनोतेः सम्यगालोचनमावश्यकम्”

( पं० राजेश्वरशास्त्री द्विविड़ )

[In this article the learned author discusses the necessity of the study of the ancient Rājanīti śāstra of India for the correct understanding of the Purāṇas. The right knowledge of the past events and episodes is mainly based on the *śabda-pramāṇa* or word-authority. The Bauddhas, however, did not recognise *śabda-pramāṇa*, and consequently they were not willing to recognise the authority of the Vedas and the Purāṇas. The Bauddha period extending for about 1000 years from the 6th century B. C. onward was a very critical period for the followers of the Vedas and the Purāṇas. This period even jeopardised the very existence of the Vedic and the Puranic literatures. The Bauddha scholars questioned the authority of the Vedas and the Purāṇas and recognised the validity and authority of only such secular śāstrās as *Vyākaraṇa*, *Sāhitya*, *Ayurveda*, *Rājanīti* etc. Such treatises on politics, as Kautilya's Arthaśāstra and Kāmandaka-Nītisāra were studied even by Bauddha scholars, and one of them wrote the famous Jayamaṅgalā commentary on the Kāmandaka Nītisāra. Hence the importance of rājanīti for every school of thought is self-evident.

The article discusses in the traditional dialectical style the broad principles of Rājanīti as expounded by Kautilya and Kāmandaka, the validity and scope of *śabda-pramāṇa* and also the definition and importance of *śakti* (which has been explained as *samśekha-viśeṣa* or *tejo-viśeṣa*). It has been held that Nīti-śakti was the seed of all poetic inspirations of the ancient Rishis and Āchāryas who were the seers or authors of the Vedas, Purāṇas and Dharmśāstras ; their word, therefore, should be accepted as authoritative. So in the opinion of the



learned author of this article the Purāṇas are as authoritative as the Rājanīti-śāstras ; only their corrupt readings arising out of the negligence or incompetence of the scribes need emendation.]

इत आरभ्य प्रायः षड्विंशतिशतेभ्यः पूर्ववत्सरेभ्यो बौद्धधर्मस्य जैनधर्मस्य च प्रवर्तकयोगैतमबुद्धमहावीरस्वामिनोराविर्भावः । ततः प्रभृति प्रायः सहस्रवत्सरपर्यन्तं इतःपूर्वं षोडशशतवर्षेभ्यः समयो वैदिकधर्मस्य महान् सङ्कटकाल आसौदिति इतिहासविदां विदितम् । अस्य सङ्कटकालस्य पूर्वसमये पुराणानां नामानि श्रुतिस्मृतिषूपलभ्यमानानि यं ग्रन्थविशेषं पुराणसंज्ञया व्यपदिशन्ति, तद्विषये बौद्धसङ्कटनिवृत्त्यनन्तरमुपलब्धेषु पुराणेषु यद्रूपमुपलभ्यते तदेव पूर्वमप्यासीन्नवा ? इति प्रश्नमुत्थाप्य तदन्तर्गततया अधुनोपलभ्यमानानां पुराणान्तर्गतधर्मशास्त्रभागानां बौद्धयुगपूर्वभाविपुराणेष्वस्तित्वमासीन्नवेत्यवान्तरप्रश्नः ऐतिहासिकैरुत्थापितो वर्तते ।

अस्मिन् वैदिकसङ्कटकाले वैदिकानां दुर्बलत्वाद्वाजाश्रयाभावाच्च तत्कालीनात्मपरिस्थितिनिदर्शने दृढानि प्रमाणानि दुर्लभानि भवन्ति । अतः पौराणिकधर्मोपरि नानाविधानामाक्षेपाणामुद्गमः अधुनातने वाङ्मये दृश्यते । अतस्तावत्कालमध्ये पौराणिकधर्मपृष्ठपोषकं दृढतरं प्रमाणं किमप्यनिर्णय कथमपि पौराणिकानामात्मरक्षणं न सम्भवतीत्यतः प्रथमं केचन विचारास्तावत्कालमध्ये आत्मस्थितिपोषणाय वैदिकानामनुकूल उपस्थाप्यन्ते । अनन्तरं प्रकृतो विषयस्तदन्तर्गत एव निर्णेतुमिष्यते ।

अतीतायाः कस्या अपि घटनाया गवेषणं प्राधान्येन शब्दप्रमाणायत्तं भवति । बौद्धादीनां युगे शब्दप्रामाण्यस्यैव निरस्तत्वात्सर्वेषां वैदिकानामसत्यत्वादित्वाशङ्कनं भवति । अतः कथं शब्दप्रामाण्यं परीक्षणीयम् ? केन दृढेन प्रमाणेन ? कानि शब्दप्रमाणस्य स्थानानीत्यादयो विषया राजनीतिं पुरस्कृत्यैवाल्लोचनीयतां नीता युक्ताः ।

“आन्वीक्षिको त्रयी वार्त्ता दण्डनीतिश्च शाश्वती”<sup>१</sup>

इतिवदन् नीतिसारकारो राजनीतिं शाश्वतीमङ्गीचकार ।

“सा च शाश्वती नित्यस्थितिका, तस्याः प्रवर्तमानाया विघ्नेनानुच्छेदा”  
दिति वदन् तट्टीकाजयमङ्गलकारस्तादृशसङ्कटकालेऽपि वैदिकानां शरणं राजनीति-  
शास्त्रमुदाजहार ।

एवं स्थिते राजनीतौ किं पुराणस्य स्थानम् ? किं वा धर्मशास्त्रस्य ?  
कानि वा शब्दप्रमाणस्य स्थानानि ? इत्यादयो विषया आलोच्यमानाः पूर्वो-  
हासोन्मीलने सहायका भवितुमर्हन्तीत्यतः प्राधान्येन राजनीतिमधिकृत्य सर्वोऽपि  
पूर्वोपस्थितविषयोऽस्मिन्लेखे क्रमेण विचार्यते ।

राजनीतिर्हि त्रिविधा अवस्थाभेदाद्भवतीत्युक्तमुपाध्यायनिरपेक्षायां नीति-  
सारव्याख्यायाम्—लक्ष्यलक्षणोभयज्ञोत्तमजननिष्ठा प्रथमा । केवललक्ष्यज्ञमध्यमजन-  
निष्ठा द्वितीया । केवललक्षणज्ञकनिष्ठजननिष्ठा तृतीया इति ।<sup>१</sup>

तत्र कनिष्ठनीतिः प्रारम्भिकी । उत्तमनिष्ठा तु तस्याः परिणतं रूपम् । इदं  
रूपं वसिष्ठस्मृतिटीकायामुपलभामहे ।

“आदौ शास्त्रान्धकारे पतित इव ततोऽभ्यासमार्गेचरिष्णुः  
पश्चाद्भ्युत्पत्तिदेहह्युपग इव ततः शक्तिवाटीप्रविष्टः ।  
नानाशब्दास्त्यपुष्पावचयकरणतो वाग्वशीभूतविश्वो-  
यत्प्रेमापाङ्गदृष्ट्या भवति कविवरो भारती सा पुनातु ॥”

अत्र हि पद्ये शक्त्यवस्थापनायाः राजनीतेरेव कवित्वबीजभूताया उत्तमजन-  
निष्ठायाः प्राप्तिः राजनीत्यपेक्षितसर्वलोकवशीकरणकारणं भवतीति स्फुटं सूच्यते ।

“अलसं विक्रमे श्रान्तं विहतोपायचेष्टितम् ।  
क्षयव्ययप्रवासैश्च श्रमेण विपरिदुतम् ।  
भीरुं मूर्खं स्त्रियं बालं धार्मिकं दुर्जनं पशुम् ।  
मैत्रीप्रधानं कल्याणबुद्धिं सान्त्वेन साधयेत् ॥”<sup>२</sup>

१. लक्षणस्थो निरुद्धस्तु लक्ष्यवेदी तु मध्यमः ।

उभयं यो विजानाति स उत्तम इति स्मृतः॥ इति । का० नी० ५ स०, ७४ श्लो०  
श्लो० व्याख्यायामुपाध्यायनिरपेक्षायाम् ।

२. का० नी० १८ स०, ४५-४६ श्लो ।

इत्यादिना वर्णितः प्रायः सर्व एव जानपदो जनः कवित्वबीजभूतया शक्त्यैव सान्त्वनाप्रदानपुरस्सरं वशीकरणीयो भवति ।

“संवासिभ्यो बलं सत्त्वमारोग्यं शीलमेव च ।”<sup>१</sup>

इति नीतिसारोक्तप्रकारेण सर्वजनसंवासः शक्तिमत्येव सात्त्विके जने निश्चीयते । अत एव तादृशाः शक्तिसम्पन्नाः शङ्करभगवत्पादप्रभृतयस्तस्मिन्काले जगद्गुरुतां गता इति स्मर्यते ।

“मनसि सदा सुसमाधिनि विस्फुरणमनेकधाऽभिधेयस्य ।

अङ्घ्रिष्ठानि पदानि च विभान्ति यस्यामसौ शक्तिः ॥”<sup>२</sup>

इति शक्तिलक्षणं शङ्करभगवत्पादोक्तिषु सौन्दर्यलहर्ह्यादिषु सर्वैर्लोकोत्तरमनुभूयते इति राजनीतिदृष्ट्या तेषां शिष्टाग्रेसरत्वं सिध्यति ।

तैर्यत्पुराणानां स्वरूपमङ्गीकृतं तत्तस्मिन् समये समस्तेन शिष्टजगताऽङ्गीकृतमित्युक्तौ नात्युक्तिः काऽपि सम्भाव्यते । तथापि तेषां वैदिकपौराणिकधर्मपक्षपातिनां वचनमात्रेण किमप्यनिर्णय्य बौद्धादीनां तत्प्रतिपक्षभूतानामप्यादरणीयेभ्यो राजनीतिग्रन्थेभ्यः प्रमाणान्युपस्थाप्य यदि किमपि विविच्यते तदतीव दार्ढ्यकरं भवतीति हेतोः शक्तिमतां राजनीतिज्ञानां वचनान्यपीतिहाससाक्षितया उपस्थापयितुं युज्यन्त एव । तर्ककर्कशया सरण्या इतिहासे गवेषणीये राजनीतेः तार्किकपरिचितशब्दबहुलो लक्षणभागः अवश्यमालोचनीयो भवति, साहित्यसुषमामधुरो लक्ष्यभागोऽपि । द्वितीयभागे आलोच्यमाने सरस्वती भगवती—

“दोर्भिर्युक्ता चतुर्भिः स्फटिकमणिमयीमक्षमालां दधाना

हस्तेनैकेन पद्मं सितमपि च शुक्रं पुस्तकं चापरेण ।

भासा कुन्देन्दुशङ्खस्फटिकमणिनिभा भासमाना समाना

सा मे वाग्देवतेयं निवसतु वदने सर्वदा सुप्रसन्ना ॥”<sup>३</sup>

इति मधुरध्यानगता चेतांसि रञ्जयति । लक्षणभागे त्वाल्लोच्यमाने बैय्याकरणतार्किकादिपारिभाषिकशब्दकर्कशत्वात्—

१. का० नी० ४ स०, ३६ श्लो० ।

२. काव्य प्र० १ उल्ला०, ३ श्लो० शोकुलनाथोपाध्यायकृतविवरणे ।

३. श्रीतत्त्वकलानिधौ ।

“घण्टाशूलद्वलानि शङ्खमुसले चक्रं धनुः सायकं  
हस्ताब्जैर्दधती घनान्तविलसच्छीतांशुतुल्यप्रभाम् ।  
गौरीदेहसमुद्भवां त्रिजगतामाधारभूतां महा-  
पूर्वामत्र सरस्वतीमनुभजे शुम्भादिदैत्यादिनीम्” ॥<sup>१</sup>

इत्यादिकमतिभयंकरं रूपं बिभ्रती ध्येयतां गच्छति । सैवाधारभूता महा-  
सरस्वती सर्वस्यापि वाङ्मयस्येति हि प्रोक्तपद्ये वर्णितम् ।

अतः उपरितने भागे पर्यालोच्यमाने लेखस्य श्रुतिकटुत्वं भवति, तर्हि  
वास्तविकैः सरस्वत्युपासकैरुभयमपि सोढव्यम् ।

कण्ठकोणविनिविष्टमीश ! ते  
कालकूटमपि मेऽमृतोपमम् ।  
अप्युपात्तममृतं भवद्वपु-  
र्भेदवृत्ति यदि मे न रोचते ॥

इति वास्तविकभक्तोक्तिमनुसृत्य कालकूटमपि ध्येयस्वरूपान्तर्गतममृततुल्य-  
तयाऽङ्गीकर्तव्यं भवति ।

तदिदं सिद्धम्, अतीतविषये शब्दप्रमाणानामुपस्थापने राजनीतिसम्मतं  
शक्तिमत्त्वं तेषामालोचनीयं भवति । शास्त्रान्धकारनिमज्जनपूर्वकाम्थासकष्टानुभव-  
पूर्वकव्युत्पत्तिलाभपर्यन्तो लक्षणभागः, व्युत्पत्तिसहकृतशक्तिपूर्वको लक्ष्यभाग इति  
दक्षिणोत्तरभागाविव देहगतौ स्वभावादेवोष्णशीतलावालोचनाविषयतां नेयौ भवतः  
सरस्वत्याः शरीरे । उभयोर्भागयोर्घटनेनैकस्य शरीरस्य निष्पत्तिः । तत्प्रस्तुत-  
विषयानुसारेण राजनीतेर्दक्षिणभागोऽधुना समुपस्थाप्यते ।

पुराणपत्रिकापाठकानां पुरतः अयं भागः प्रोक्तरीत्या अधुना बलादागतो  
वर्तते । तत्र कटुतमे दक्षिणभागे भारतीयराजनीतौ पुराणस्य किं प्रयोजनम् ?  
धर्मशास्त्राणां चेत्यविचार्याय प्रश्नो न समाधातुं शक्यः । तद्विचारणे कर्तव्ये  
शब्दप्रमाणस्यापि का नामावश्यकता ? कथं वा तत्परीक्षणीयमिति प्रश्नोऽप्य-  
वश्यमालोचनीयतामर्हति । अत्र लेखे यथावसरमेते प्रश्ना विचार्यन्ते ।

भारतीयराजनीतौ तावच्छब्दप्रमाणस्यावश्यकतोक्ता कौटिल्येन । “प्रत्यक्ष-  
परोक्षानुमेया हि राजवृत्तिरिति<sup>१</sup> । अत्र हि परोक्षशब्देन शब्दप्रमाणमेव  
परिगृहीतं तेन । तथाहि “स्वयं दृष्टं प्रत्यक्षं परोपदिष्टं परोक्षं कर्मसु कृतेनाकृत-  
वेक्षणमनुमेयमिति<sup>२</sup> । जयमङ्गलायां च परैरविसंवादकैरुपदिष्टं परोपदिष्ट-  
मित्युक्तम्<sup>३</sup> ।

एवंविधपरोक्षप्रमाणस्य स्थानानि कौटिल्यानुसारिणा कामन्दकेन निर्दिष्टानि ।  
यथा—

“साधु तेषाममात्यानां तद्विद्येभ्यस्तु बुद्धिमान् ।  
चक्षुष्मत्तां च शिल्पं च परीक्षेत गुणद्वयम् ॥  
स्वजनेभ्यो विजानीयात्कुलं स्थानमवग्रहम् ।  
संवासिभ्यो बलं सत्त्वमारोग्यं शीलमेव च ॥  
अस्तब्धतामचापल्यम् . . . . .” इति ।<sup>४</sup>

व्याख्यातं चेदं वाक्यत्रयं जयमङ्गलाकृता । यथा—

“तद्विद्येभ्यस्तु बुद्धिमानिति । तद्विद्येभ्यः—तुल्यशास्त्रशिल्पविद्येभ्यः स्वयमपि  
तद्विद्यश्चक्षुष्मत्तां शिल्पं च परीक्षेत गुणद्वयम्, समानविद्येभ्य आगमयेदित्यर्थः ।

“स्वजनेभ्यो विजानीयात्कुलं स्थानमवग्रहमिति । स्थानं-जनपदः, स्वजना  
हि विशेषेण कुलादीन् जानन्ति । एभ्य एवागमयेदित्यागमप्रदर्शनमेतत् ।

“संवासिभ्य इति । तत्सहोषितेभ्यो बलादीन्यतर्कणीयान्यागमयेत् ।  
अस्तब्धतामचापल्यं च संवासिभ्य एवेत्यागमप्रदर्शनम्” । इति ।

मन्त्रिगुणपरीक्षाप्रकरणे आगमप्रमाणस्यैवमावश्यकता प्रतिपादिता यद्यपि  
तथापि—

१. कौ० अधि १ अध्याय ९ ।

२. कौ० अधि० १-१ अ० १२-१३ सू० ।

३. “परोक्षं परैरविसंवादकैरुपदिष्टं वचनेन संस्थया परोक्षं परप्रत्यक्षमाप्तोपदेश इत्यर्थः ।

वक्ष्यति च “त्रयाणामेकवाक्ये सम्प्रत्ययः” इति । कौ० १ अधि० ९ अ० ।

४. का०नी० ४ स० श्लो० ३२-३३-३६ ।

“गावो ब्राणेन पश्यन्ति वेदैः पश्यन्ति ब्राह्मणाः ।

चारैः पश्यन्ति राजानश्चक्षुर्भ्यामितरे जनाः ॥”<sup>१</sup>

इत्युक्त्यनुसारेण राज्ञां दृष्टिरेव चारवाक्यरूपा भवतीति सर्वलोकाप्रसिद्धमेतत् । वर्तमाना भविष्यत्कालीना च राजनीतिः पञ्चमाङ्गभूतांश्चारान् विहाय कथमपि पद्मात्पदमपि विचलितुं न समर्था । अत एव चारप्रकरणोक्तं “त्रयाणामेकवाक्ये सम्प्रत्ययः”<sup>२</sup> इति सूत्रमेव परोक्षप्रमाणस्यावश्यकतायामुद्धृतं जयमङ्गलाकृता ।

एवं रीत्या चारवाक्यरूपशब्दप्रमाणस्यावश्यकतायां स्थितायां कथं तत्प्रामाण्यं परीक्षणीयमित्यपि विचार्यते । अत्र विषये उक्तं कौटिल्येन “त्रयाणामेकवाक्ये सम्प्रत्ययः, तेषामभीक्ष्णविनिपाते तूष्णीं दण्डः प्रतिषेधोवा” इति<sup>३</sup> । व्याख्यातमिदं जयमङ्गलाकृता सूत्रम्—

“तत्रापि त्रयाणामेकवाक्यत्वे सम्प्रत्ययः सम्यगैकान्तिकी प्रतीतिरित्यर्थः । कदाचिदेकस्य द्वयोर्वा परोपग्रहोऽसम्यगुपलब्धिर्वा स्यात् । तेषामिति चाराणाम् । अभीक्ष्णविनिपाते पुनःपुनर्विस्वादाने । तूष्णीं दण्डः प्रच्छन्नवधः, प्रतिषेधो निवारणम् । मा भूत्प्रकाशवधेऽन्यसञ्चरणामुत्पास इति । सक्कद्विर्वा प्रमादाज्ञानादिभिर्विस्वादादयतस्तूपक्षेते, न पुनरेवं कार्यमिति” । इति ।

एतदङ्गतयैव नियोक्तव्यानां चाराणां विशेषणतया कश्चिदावश्यको गुणोऽभिहितः कौटिल्येन—

“न चान्योन्यं संस्थास्ते वा विद्युरिति”<sup>४</sup>

व्याख्यातं चेदं जयमङ्गलाकृता सूत्रम् ।

“न चान्योन्यमिति, न च संस्थाः संस्थान्तरं ते च सञ्चाराः सञ्चारान्तरं विद्युः सञ्जायनपरिहारार्थम् । एकस्मिन् वा ज्ञाते मा भूत्सर्वग्रहणमिति” इति ।

अनेन हि सन्दर्भेण नियुक्तानां त्रयाणां चाराणां परस्परमविज्ञातानां वाक्येषु विस्वादाभावो दृढं प्रामाण्ये कारणमिति सिद्धं भवति । अतएवाविस्वादादकैः परैरुपदिष्टमिति हि वर्णितम् ।

१. विदुरनीतौ ३४ अ० ३४ ।

२. कौ० १-१२-१७ ।

३. कौ० १ अ० १२ अ० १७ ।

४. कौ० १-१२ ।

अनया हि प्रक्रियया यस्यां कस्यामपि राजनीत्यां चारचक्षुषां राज्ञां तद्वाक्यरूपचक्षुर्निर्माणप्रकारः तत्प्रामाण्ये च दृढं कारणं स्फुटं भवति, यत्र न कोऽपि विप्रतिपत्तुमर्हति ।

अस्तु नाम चारग्राह्ये वस्तुन्येवं शब्दप्रमाणस्यावश्यकता, पुराणादिशास्त्रात्मकस्य कर्तव्यज्ञातव्याद्यर्थविषये शब्दप्रमाणस्यानुसरणीयत्वं किमर्थमङ्गीकर्तव्यमिति प्रश्नोऽपि प्रसङ्गागतोऽधुना विचार्यते, नीते: सुन्दरतमधर्मस्वरूपत्वात् । अयं प्रश्नो—नीतिशास्त्रस्यावश्यकत्वमस्ति न वेति प्रसङ्गे जयमङ्गलायां विचारितः । स यथा—

- ( १ ) “अत्र केचिदाहुः,<sup>१</sup> धर्मस्यालौकिकत्वात्तदभिधायकं शास्त्रम्, अर्थ-  
स्थोपायपूर्वकत्वादुपायस्य शास्त्रपूर्वकत्वाद्युक्तं तदर्थं वार्ताशास्त्रम् ।
- ( २ ) नीतिशास्त्रं तु न युक्तम्, यतो नीतिशास्त्रमनर्थकमिति ।
- ( ३ ) प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमप्रमाणदेशकालशक्तिपुरस्सरार्थसाधनविनियोगलक्षणा  
क्रिया नीतिः, सा प्रेक्षावताम् ।
- ( ४ ) दृश्यते नीतिं विना पशूनां तत्कल्पानां च बालानामात्महितवृणस्त-  
न्याहारादिप्राप्तिरनिमित्ता ।
- ( ५ ) शीतोष्णवातवर्षादिपरिहारश्च फलम् ।
- ( ६ ) तथाऽनधीतशास्त्राणामपि म्लेच्छादीनां जलारण्यान्तरिक्षवर्त्तिमोनमृग-  
पक्षिबन्धनार्थसाधनविनियोगलक्षणा नीतिः ।
- ( ७ ) तथा शास्त्रविदां तुल्येपि शास्त्रे केषाञ्चिदर्थेन योगः  
केषाञ्चिदनर्थेनेति ।
- ( ८ ) अत्रोच्यते—
- ( ९ ) “नीतेर्विना फलं नास्ति शास्त्रेणैकान्तिको नयः ।  
शास्त्रे सत्यपि नावश्यमिति सर्वेष्वदः समम् ॥” इति ।

( १० ) पशवो हि मनुष्यप्रयुक्तैः पाशकूटादिभिरुपहन्यमानाः पाशादिविमो-

१. कौ० जयमङ्गला १ अ०, मद्रासनगरे कुम्पुस्वामिइन्स्टिट्यूटत्रैमासिके जर्नल  
आफ ओरिएण्टल रिसर्च मद्रास, सेक्रेटरी डॉ० वि० राघवन् द्वारा प्रदत्ते ।

चनाकुशला विनार्शः, बालाश्च परिहारानभिज्ञाः सर्पाद्युपद्रवादिकमासा-  
दयन्तो नीतेर्विना दृश्यन्ते ।

(११) अतो नीतेर्विना फलं नास्ति ।

(१२) अनधीतशास्त्राणामपि यत्कदाचिद्धिताहितप्राप्तिपरिवर्जनं तदपि  
यादृच्छिकीं नीतिमेवासाधय भवति ।

(१३) सा चैवंविधा नीतिर्घुणाक्षरकल्पत्वादनान्धासा ।

(१४) अपनयबाहुल्याश्चैते शास्त्रविद्विरुद्धासीक्रियन्ते ।

(१५) शास्त्रेण तु सम्यक्करणीयवर्जनीयविधानादैकान्तिकत्वं नीतेः क्रियते ।

(१६) उपदेशादिष्वप्यसावपरिच्छेदोऽप्येषां यदा भवति तदा प्रामाण्यम-  
न्येभ्य एव ।

(१७) तथा हि ।

(१८) “उपदेशादनायोगाद्वासनानुगमादपि ।

परयत्नाददृष्टाद्वा सर्वाः सर्वत्र वृत्तयः ॥”

इत्येषां हिताहितप्राप्तिपरिहारौ ।

(१९) क्वचिन्मात्रादिचरितोपदेशापेक्षया, नहीदं कुर्विदं मा कर्षीरिति  
वाचैव श्रोतॄणां शब्दार्थप्रतिपत्तृणामुपदेशः, किं तर्हि ? अनुकर्तॄणां  
नान्त्रोपदेशवदुपदेशः ।

(२०) कदाचिदनायोगात्, यस्यां प्रवृत्तौ बाध्यन्ते, न च फलं प्राप्नुवन्ति,  
ततो निवृत्त्यान्यत्र निरावाधं फलं च किञ्चिन्नलभमानाः पौनःपुन्येन  
इदमतो दुःखमन्यथाऽदुःखं भवतीति तमोबाहुल्येऽपि यच्च यावच्च  
प्राकार्यं लभन्ते ।

(२१) कदाचिद्वासनानुगमाच्च, अनन्तरेषु व्यवहितेषु च जन्मसु दर्शनश्रव-  
णादिभिः सर्वपदार्थस्वभावपरिच्छेदानुभूतलोकयात्राणां यदृच्छोत्पन्न-  
वासनाप्रबोधानां हिताहितवस्तुन्यभिलाषेतरो भवतः ।

(२२) ततश्चाभिप्रेतलभः परिहारश्च ।



- (२३) कदाचित्परप्रयत्नात्, उपकरणसम्यदायत्तमात्मोपकारं मन्यमानो गोवत्साविषदं मातुरुद्धःप्रदेशे योजयन् स्वार्थं साधयति ।
- (२४) साऽन्येषां च परनीत्यपेक्षया प्रवृत्तिः साफल्यं कुरुते ।
- (२५) कदाचिददृष्टात्, पूर्ववेद्योत्पन्नौ धर्माधर्मौ प्रत्युत्पन्नपरिपाकौ देहकारणानां सज्जिवेशविशेषरचनायाः कारणीभवतः ।
- (२६) एवमिष्टानिष्टप्राप्तिपरिहारनिमित्तप्रवृत्तिविशेषायानन्ताय पुरुषतर्कागोचराय तावेव प्रभवतः ।
- (२७) इति न किञ्चिदनिमित्तं फलमस्ति ।
- (२८) येषामपि शास्त्रविदां केषाञ्चिदपनयादनर्थेन योगः स तेषामेवापराधो न शास्त्रस्य ।
- (२९) नौलङ्कः पश्यतीत्यादित्येन नोदेतव्यम् ?
- (३०) प्रतिपत्त्रपराधाच्च शास्त्रानर्थक्यं सर्वशास्त्रेषु तुल्यम् ।
- (३१) स्वर्गारोग्यापवर्गार्थेषु शास्त्रेषु न सर्वे तद्विदो धर्माधर्मसेवापरिहारयोः पथ्यापथ्याहारसेवासेवयोः रागाविहानौ तत्त्वज्ञाने चामिनिविशमाना दृश्यन्ते ।
- (३२) ये तदर्थिनो भक्तिश्रद्धान्वितास्तेऽपि शास्त्राणां प्रयोजनहेतव इत्यन्य-शास्त्रवदिवमप्यादरणीयमिति” इति ।

अयं जयमङ्गलाग्रन्थो मुद्रितपुस्तकेऽपेक्षितं संशोधनं विधायास्मामिरूढतः ।  
अथ दुर्बोधत्वादयं ग्रन्थो व्याख्यायते—

अत्र हि आदिमैः सप्तभिर्वाक्यैर्नीतिशास्त्रस्य वैयर्थ्यमाशङ्क्योपरितनैर्वाक्यैर्म-  
क्तिश्रद्धापूर्वकं तस्यादरणीयं व्यवस्थाप्यते । आशङ्काग्रन्थे सप्तवाक्यात्मके  
धर्मशास्त्राणां, अर्थशास्त्रान्तर्गतवार्ताशास्त्राणां चावश्यकत्वं प्रथमवाक्येनैव निर्धार्य  
स्वीकृतम् । उपरितनैः षड्भिस्तत्रत्यैर्वाक्यैर्नीतिशास्त्रस्य निष्प्रयोजनत्वमुपक्षिप्यते इति  
स्पष्टमेव । अतो निश्चयेनैतद्वक्तुं शक्यते, यल्लौकिकेष्वेवार्थेषु शब्दार्थमकस्यास्य  
शास्त्रस्य समाधानग्रन्थस्यैः पञ्चविंशतिवाक्यैरावश्यकत्वं स्थिरीकृतम्, अतश्चारम्भ-  
द्वारातिरिक्तविषयेऽपि शब्दप्रमाणस्य वक्ष्यमाणरीत्या नीत्यपेक्षितपुराणादिशास्त्र-

स्यावश्यकताव्यवस्थापने एतदग्रन्थस्योपयोगो भविष्यति । अतः प्रकृतोपयोगित्वात् द्वात्रिंशत्सङ्ख्याकानामेतेषां जयमङ्गलवाक्यानां सम्यग्विचारणं न विषयान्तरसञ्चरणं मन्तव्यम् । एतेषु वाक्येषु प्रथमवाक्येन धर्मशास्त्रवार्ताशास्त्रयोरावश्यकत्वे स्थिरीकृते नीतिशास्त्रस्यानर्थक्यशङ्कनं द्वितीयवाक्यस्य विषयः । उपरितनैः पञ्चभिर्वाक्यैर्निष्प्रयोजनत्वमेतत्स्फुटीक्रियते । नीतेः शास्त्रसम्मतं स्वरूपमनिर्धार्य तत्र निष्प्रयोजनतायाः साधयितुमशक्यत्वात्तृतीयवाक्येन प्रथमतस्तत्स्वरूपमनूदितम् । चतुर्थपञ्चमाभ्यां वाक्याभ्यामेवं लक्षणोपाया नीतेरनावश्यकता, षष्ठेन वाक्येन नीतेरावश्यकत्वेऽपि स्लेच्छदृष्टान्तेन तत्र शास्त्रस्यानावश्यकत्वम्, सप्तमेन तु शास्त्रसत्त्वेऽपि तस्य वैयर्थ्यमाशङ्कितम् । अतएवास्य शङ्कात्रयस्य यथाक्रममुत्तरम्,—

१. नीतेर्विना फलं नास्ति ।

२. शास्त्रेणैकान्तिको नयः ।

३. शास्त्रे सत्यपि नावश्यमिति सर्वेष्वदः समम् ।

इति त्रिसंख्यारूपेण नवमेन वाक्येन भविष्यतीति शङ्काग्रन्थस्य सर्वस्यापि शङ्कात्रय एव तात्पर्यमित्यत्र न विवादः ।

तत्र स्लेच्छराजनीतिप्रचारवत्यधुनातनसमये नीतिशक्तिं विनापि जीवनं भविष्यतीति शङ्काया अनुत्थितिरेव । अतो दशमैकादशवाक्याभ्यां यदुक्तं जयमङ्गलकृता तद्विषये वक्तव्यस्य नास्त्यावश्यकतेति प्रथमः पूर्वपक्षोऽनुत्थानपराहतः । द्वादशवाक्यमवलम्ब्य च शिष्टान्येकविंशतिवाक्यान्यालोचनीयतामर्हन्ति ।

“अनधीतशास्त्राणामपि यत्कदाचिद्विज्ञातहितप्राप्तिवर्जनं तदपि यादृच्छिकी नीतिमेवासाद्य भवती”तीदं वाक्यं यादृच्छिकपदघटितत्वात् “कदाचिद्विज्ञानानुगमाच्च, अनन्तरेषु व्यवहितेषु च जन्मसु सर्वपदार्थस्वभावपरिच्छेदानुभूतलोकयात्राणां यदृच्छोत्पन्नवासनाप्रबोधानां हिताहितवस्तुन्यभिलाषेतारौ भवतः” इति विंशतितमेन वाक्येन स्फुटीक्रियते ।

“स्वभावमीश्वरं कालं यदृच्छां नियतिं तथा ।

परिणामं च मन्यन्ते प्रकृतिं पृथुदर्शिनः” ॥

इति सुश्रुतग्रन्थोपरि व्याख्याकर्त्रा हल्हणेन :—

“यदृच्छा पुनरलक्षितः आकस्मिकपदार्थाविर्भावः, स्वभावस्तावत्सत्त्वरजस्तमसां तद्विकाराणां पृथिव्यादिमहाभूतानां च परिणामस्य तादृशो विशेषः” इति व्याख्या-  
नाद्यदृच्छास्वभावशब्दार्थो स्फुटीभवतः । एवं चालक्षितकस्मिकपदार्थाविर्भावोद्-  
बुद्धवासनानामित्यर्थो यदृच्छोत्पन्नवासनाप्रबोधानामित्यंशस्य भवति । वक्ष्यमाण-  
गोकुलनाथोपाध्यायोक्त्यनुसारेण संस्कारविशेषरूपायाः शक्तेः पुरस्करणेन जायमाना  
नीतिर्यदृच्छोत्पन्नवासनाप्रबोधप्रयुक्ता षष्ठे वाक्ये यादृच्छिकीपदेनोच्यते । अत्र  
वासनोद्बोधकस्यालक्षितत्वलाभात्सर्वत्र शरणीकरणीयतानर्हत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते । तथा-  
विधाप्युद्बुद्धा वासना पूर्वस्मिन् कस्मिन्नपि जन्मनि शास्त्राधीनसर्वपदार्थस्वभाव-  
परिच्छेदानुभूतलोकयात्राणामेव भवतीति परम्परया शास्त्राधीनत्वमेव तस्या व्यवस्था-  
प्यते । युक्तश्चायमर्थः प्रतिभाति । ऊनविंशे वाक्ये हि अन्वयव्यतिरेकैकशरणानां  
लब्धस्य ज्ञानस्य बाध्यमानत्वमुपपाद्याधीतशास्त्राणामेव यच्च यावच्च प्राकाश्यं  
लभते इत्युपपादितम् । व्याकरणशास्त्राध्ययनेनैव सम्पूर्णं संस्कृतभाषाज्ञानं संस्कृत-  
त्वादिजात्यभिव्यक्तिश्च भवतीति दृष्टान्तेनास्माभिरप्यनुभूयते च । नव्यप्रणाल्या  
तत्तज्जन्मनि जायमानवासनोद्बोधस्य एतज्जन्मीयान्वयव्यतिरेकप्रयोगमूलकत्वेऽभ्युप-  
गम्यमाने कीरदष्टं फलं मधुरमेव भवतीति सर्वसम्मतः सिद्धान्तो भज्येत । इदमेव  
तत्त्वं “शास्त्रेणैकान्तिको नयः” इति पद्यांशेनाविष्कृतं ग्रन्थकृता । तथा च  
शास्त्रानभ्युपगमे अलक्षितनिमित्तवासनोद्बोधो वा शरणीकरणीयः, अन्वयव्यति-  
रेकाख्यतर्क एव वा पूर्वोक्तबाधासहकृतः शरणीकरणीयः, उभयधाप्यनधीतव्याकरण-  
शास्त्राणां यच्च यावच्च संस्कृतं न प्राकाश्यं लभते न्यूनाधिकसंख्याव्यवच्छेदपुरस्सरं  
साधुत्वाभिव्यक्तिश्च न भवतीति वयमनुभवामः । सम्पूर्णाया राजनीतेर्यच्च यावच्च  
प्राकाश्यं सर्वं वाङ्मयं विना न सम्भवतीति किमु वक्तव्यम् ? अतो नीतिलक्षणे  
आगमप्रमाणमावश्यकमिति सिद्धान्तितं जयमङ्गलाकृता ।

“न तत्पदं न तद्वाक्यं न सा विद्या न सा कला ।

जायते यन्न काव्याङ्गमहो ! भारो महान् कवेः” ॥

इति साहित्यमीमांसायाम्—

“विद्याः समस्ता यस्याङ्गमहो ! भारो महान् कवेः ।”

इत्यग्निपुराणे च स्मरणात् प्रोक्तस्य शक्तिपदार्थस्य लाभाय दर्शनश्रवणादिभिः

सर्वपदार्थस्वभावपरिच्छेदानुभूतलोकयात्रत्वमनन्तरेषु व्यवहितेषु वा जन्मसु यस्य, तस्यैव तादृशवासनोद्बोध इति, एकविंशतितमे वाक्येऽर्थः पर्यवसितो भवति, तदर्थं शास्त्राध्ययनाधीनः ऐकान्तिको निश्चयो भक्तिश्रद्धापुरस्सरं सम्पादनीय इति द्वात्रिंशवाक्यस्य तात्पर्यम् ।

अथ पूर्वोक्ततृतीयवाक्ये यन्नीतिस्वरूपं निर्धारितं तदसम्यग्विविच्य तत्रत्य-  
शङ्कात्रयस्यापि स्वरूपं न ज्ञायते इति तद्विमृश्यते ।

अत्र नीतिलक्षणवाक्ये जयमङ्गलाकारकृते नीतिसारव्याख्यायामुपाध्यायनिर-  
पेक्षायां निर्दिष्टान्नीतिलक्षणादस्ति कश्चिद्विशेषः । तथाहि—नीतिलक्षणमुपाध्याय-  
निरपेक्षायामेवमुक्तम्—

“प्रत्यक्षपरोक्षानुमानलक्षणप्रमाणत्रयनिर्णीतायां फलसिद्धौ देशकालानुकूल्ये  
सति यथासाध्यमुपायसाधनविनियोगलक्षणा क्रिया नीतिः” इति ।<sup>१</sup>

उपाध्यायनिरपेक्षाग्रन्थेऽस्मिन् शक्तिपदस्य निर्देशो नास्ति यो जयमङ्गल-  
कृता कृतः । जयमङ्गलायां च—

“प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च शास्त्रं च विविधागमम् ।

त्रयं सुविदितं कार्यं धर्मशुद्धिमभीप्सता” ॥<sup>२</sup>

इति मनुक्तक्रमः स्वकीयलक्षणे स्थापितः । अस्य विशेषस्य शक्तिपद-  
निवेशात्मकस्यार्थदृष्ट्या महद्गौरवं वर्तते । अर्थशास्त्र एव नवमाधिकरणे प्रथमाध्याये  
प्रथमसूत्रे “शक्तिदेशकालबलाबले”त्येवं पठितमतो देशकालशक्तीनां विचारो  
नीतौ परमावश्यक इति व्यक्तम् । सोऽयमावश्यको विषयः उपाध्यायनिरपेक्षाकृता  
कृते लक्षणे देशकालानुकूल्ये इति भागेऽव्यक्ततया स्थितोऽपि जयमङ्गलाकारेण  
स्फुटं निर्दिष्टः स्वयंकृते लक्षणे ।

शक्तौ सत्यां साधनविनियोगः स्वयमेव भवति, अतः स न प्राधान्येन  
नीतिशास्त्रस्य विषयः किन्तु शक्तिसाधनमेवेति जयमङ्गलाकृतोऽभिप्रायोऽत्र स्फुटः ।

१. काम० नी० १-६ श्लो० व्याख्यायाम् ।

२. मञ्जु० १२-१०५ ।

“रुद्रहीनं विष्णुहीनं न वदन्ति नराधमम् ।

शक्तिहीनस्तु यो मर्त्यस्तं वदन्ति नराधमम् ॥”

इति वचनानुसारेण शक्तेः समुपार्जनं तस्या यथावद्विनियोगश्च नीतिशास्त्रस्य मुख्यं लक्ष्यमिति स्थिते—

“नरत्वं दुर्लभं तत्र विद्या तत्र सुदुर्लभा ।

कवित्वं दुर्लभं तत्र शक्तिस्तत्र सुदुर्लभा ॥”

इत्यग्निपुराणवचनानुसारेण शक्तेः समुपार्जनविनियोगौ कस्यचिदेव पुण्यवतो महापुरुषस्य हस्तगतौ भवतो न सर्वेषाम् ।

यद्यपि “शक्त्यस्तिष्ठः प्रभावोत्साहमन्त्रजाः” इत्यमरकोशानुसारेणार्थशास्त्रीय-नवमाधिकरणाद्याध्यायोक्तप्रकारेण च प्रभावमन्त्रोत्साहशक्त्य एवात्र विवक्षितास्तथापि एतेषां स्वरूपनिर्धारणे किञ्चिद्वैलक्ष्यमवश्यमालोचनीयतामर्हति ।

नयचन्द्रिकाकारेण हि—“उत्साहः-शौर्यादिमत्त्वं, प्रभावः क्रोशादिमत्त्वं, मन्त्र-स्य विचारपूर्वककार्यनिश्चयस्येति व्याख्यानं कृतम् । तथाप्यमरकोशे “प्रभावोत्साह-मन्त्रजा” इति तज्जन्यत्वं निर्दिश्यते इत्यस्त्येव कश्चिदत्र विशेष आलोचनीयः ।

परस्मादात्मनो भान्ति ज्ञानानन्दक्रियाप्रभाः ।

ज्ञानप्रभा च सानन्दा तस्याः सत्त्वं प्रजायते ॥

क्रियाप्रभा रजः सत्त्वाच्छक्तिः स्यादुत्तमप्रसूः ।” इति ।<sup>१</sup>

अत्र हि सर्वान्तर्यामिपरमात्मप्रभात्रयमिश्रणस्य शक्तिरूपत्वमुच्यते ।

“स न्यस्तचिन्हामपि राजलक्ष्मीं तेजोविशेषानुमितां दधानः ।

आसीदनाविष्कृतदानराजिरन्तर्मदावस्थ इव द्विपेन्द्रः ॥”<sup>२</sup>

इति कालिदासोऽपि तादृशं प्रभाविशेषं राजशरीरे समुपलभते । तदेव तेजः कोशदण्डादिमत्त्वमिति पदेन मनुष्ययोत्तरत्वप्रत्ययवाच्येन नयचन्द्रिकाकारः प्रतिपादयति । अन्यथा “कोशदण्डादि” इत्येव ब्रूयात् ।

“सा सत्ता सा महानात्मा तामाहुस्त्वतलादयः” ।

इति वदन्तो वैय्याकरणा अपि तदेव तेजस्त्वतलादिशब्दवाच्यमिति प्रतिपादयन्ति ।

(१) भाव प्र० २ अधिकारे ४१ पृ० “गायकवाङ् ओरिएण्टल सीरिज”

(२) रघुवंशे २-७ ।

“मनसि सदा सुसमाधिनि विस्फुरणमनेकधाऽभिधेयस्य ।

अक्लिष्टानि पदानि च विभान्ति यस्यामसौ शक्तिः ॥”

इति साहित्यशास्त्रविद्विर्ध्वर्ण्यमानं शक्तितत्त्वमेतादृशः प्रकाशविशेष एव ।  
यम्—

“शक्तिर्निपुणतालोकशास्त्रकाव्याद्यवेक्षणात्”

इत्यादिना काव्यप्रकाशकारो व्याजहार ।

“अवेक्षणादिति व्याचष्टे, विमर्शनादिति । विमर्शनमनुषङ्गपौनःपुन्यम् ।  
निपुणतापदार्थं व्याचष्टे, व्युत्पत्तिरिति । तत्तदर्थगोचरो दृढतरः संस्कारः  
तत्तद्व्याख्यार्थप्रतिसन्धानं वेत्यर्थः । सगंधरावृत्तत्वावच्छेदेनादौ गुरुचतुष्कत्वमिति  
संस्कारदार्ढ्यं व्युत्पत्तिः, “सानन्दं नन्दिहस्ते”त्यादौ तत्तदानुपूर्वीकपदगोचरः संस्कारः  
शक्तिरिति विवेकः । एवं शास्त्रान्तरविधेयेष्वपि प्रणिधेयः सामान्यविशेषभावेन  
व्युत्पत्तिशक्तिविधेययोर्भेद इति गोकुलनाथोपाध्यायकृतकाव्यप्रकाशविवरणमवधेयता-  
मर्हति ।

“आदौ शास्त्रान्धकारे पतित इव ततोऽम्यासमार्गे चरिष्णुः

पश्चाद्व्युत्पत्तिदेहल्युपग इव ततः शक्तिवाटीप्रविष्टः ।

नानाशब्दाख्यपुष्पावचयकरणतो वाग्वशीभूतविश्वो,

यत्प्रेमापाङ्गदृष्ट्या भवति कविवरो भारती सा पुनातु ॥”

इति वसिष्ठस्मृतिटीकामङ्गलपद्ये अन्धकारमयाच्छास्त्रावरणात्तृतीयां व्युत्पत्ति-  
कक्षामतीत्य लब्धो वाटिकाविशेषरूपः संस्कारविशेष एव शक्तितत्त्वमिति वर्ण्यते ।  
तदेतद्गोकुलनाथोपाध्यायोक्तरीत्या सामान्यविशेषगोचरोद्भूतसंस्कारयोर्व्युत्पत्तिशक्ति-  
रूपत्वे घटते । विशेषतः शक्तिरूपस्योद्भूतसंस्कारस्य प्रकाशमयत्वं वाटिकारूपकेण  
स्फुटीभवति, संस्काराणां प्रत्यक्षज्ञानजनकत्वस्य तद्ग्रन्थादेवावगमात् ।<sup>१</sup>

१. गोकुलनाथोपाध्यायकृतकाव्यप्रकाशविवरणे १ उक्ता० ३ श्लो० ।

२. “व्यञ्जनया पिण्डीकृते वस्तुनि काव्येन साक्षात्कार एव जन्यते । तदुक्तम्—

“शब्दोपहितरूपास्ताश्च बुद्धेर्विषयतां गतान् ।

प्रत्यक्षानिव वंसादौ च साधनत्वेन मन्यन्ते ॥” इति ।

काव्यप्रकाशे ४ अ० गोकुलनाथोपाध्यायकृतविवरणे ।

पूर्वोक्तपद्ये शास्त्रान्धकार इत्युपक्रमादुत्तरोत्तरं सूक्ष्मतरसूक्ष्मस्फुटप्रकाशलाभस्ता-  
स्ववस्थासु लभ्यते । सामान्यविशेषप्रकाशयोर्भेदस्तु न्यायमञ्जरीकारेणैवं माघपद्य-  
मुदाहृत्य वर्णितः ।

“चयस्त्विषामित्यवधारितं पुरा ततः शरीरीति विभाविताकृतिम् ।

विभुर्विभक्तावयवं पुमानिति क्रमादमुं नारद इत्यबोधि सः ॥” इति ॥<sup>१</sup>

रामायणाद्युपवर्णितेषु रामरावणादिपदेषु यद्रामत्वरावणत्वादिकं प्रकाशते,  
तद्धि उदात्तनायकत्वादिरूपं सामान्यप्रकाशरूपमेव भवत्याधुनिकतमानामपि ।

“यदादित्यगतं तेजो जगद्धासयतेऽखिलम् ।

यच्चन्द्रमसि यच्चाग्नौ तत्तेजो विद्धि मामकम् ॥”<sup>२</sup>

इति गीतापद्ये भास्वरूपविशिष्टो यस्तेजोविशेषः उपास्यतया प्रतिपाद्यते सः—

“अहं वैश्वानरो भूत्वा प्राणिनां देहमाश्रितः” ।

इत्यादिगीतावाक्येनेश्वररूपतया वर्ण्यते । स बहिः घटपटादिषदवाच्य-  
जातिरूपः सन्—

“समानोऽमिसमीपस्थः क्रोष्ठे चरति सर्वतः ।

अन्नं गृह्णाति पचति विवेचयति मुञ्चति ॥”<sup>३</sup>

इति भावप्रकाशनोक्तरीत्या विद्युत्समूहमयत्वात्तत्तज्जातीयव्यक्तीनामनन्तानां  
सृष्टिजनकः, एकः सूर्य इवासंख्येषु दर्पणादिषूपाधिषु अनन्तानां सूर्यप्रतिबिम्बानां  
जनकः—

“सर्वदा सर्वभावानां सामान्यं वृद्धिकारणम् ।

ह्लासहेतुर्विशेषश्च प्रवृत्तिरुभयस्य तु ॥

सामान्यमेकत्वकरं विशेषस्तु पृथक्त्वकृतम् ॥”<sup>४</sup>

इति चरकसंहितोक्तवैद्यकसिद्धान्तसिद्धः,

१. माघे १-३ । २. भगवद्गीता १४-१२ ।

३. भाव प्र० ७ अधिकारे १९४ पृ०, गायकवाड ओरिएण्टल सीरिज ।

४. चरके सूत्रस्थाने ४२-४३ ।

“यथाह्वयं ज्योतिरात्मा विवस्वानपो भिन्ना बहुधैकोऽनुगच्छन् । उपाधिना क्रियते भेदरूपः” इत्यादिश्रुत्या ज्ञायते । प्राज्ञतैजसविश्वात्मकेषु जीवस्वरूपेषु स्वप्नदशायां पिताख्यतेजःप्रचुरत्वादात्मप्रकाशमयत्वाद्वा तैजस इति वेदान्तशास्त्रे व्यपदिश्यते च ।

विद्युत्किरणैरेव सर्वजगत्सृष्टिर्जातिति वदद्भिराधुनिकैर्वैज्ञानिकैरपि निर्विवादं प्रत्यक्षीक्रियत इव ।

“एकोऽहं बहु स्यां प्रजाये”ति श्रुत्या वर्ण्यमाना जगन्मूलप्रकृतिगतैर्यं शक्तिः स्वतन्त्रचेतननिष्ठेति पौराणिकानां सिद्धान्तः ।

जडप्रकृतिनिष्ठेति निरीश्वरवादिनां नवीनवैज्ञानिकानाम् । “स्वातन्त्र्यमेव चेतनत्वं, पारतन्त्र्यमेव जडत्वमिति नवीनवैज्ञानिकाविरुद्धप्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शनोक्तजडचेतन-लक्षणानुसारेण तु तस्याश्चेतननिष्ठत्वमिति पौराणिकसिद्धान्त एव हृदयावर्जको भवति । अथमेवेच्छाज्ञानक्रियाशक्त्यात्मकः समूहः आनन्दरूपतामपि गच्छति । तथा च यस्यैव पुरुषस्य ज्ञानाधिक्यं क्रियाशक्त्याधिक्यं तदुभयवशेन सफलेच्छता च स एव शक्तिमानुत्तमश्चेतिगीयते । इदं शक्त्याधिक्यं जगन्मूलभूतायां प्रकृतावीश्वरे निरवधिकं मन्तुमुचितम् । तदीयानां नियमानामनुसरणेनैव मनुष्यजातेरप्यभ्युन्नतिर्भवितुमर्हतीत्यत्र नास्त्येव पौराणिकनवीनमतयोः कोपि भेदः । इयानेव परं विशेषोऽनयोर्मतयोः—“यदेव किञ्चानूचानोऽभ्यूह्यत्वार्षं तद्भवती”ति निरुक्त-स्मृत्यनुसारेण पूर्वशास्त्रानुसरणमुन्नतेर्बीजमिति पौराणिका वदन्ति । पूर्वयुगमज्ञान-बहुलमुत्तरोत्तरं प्रज्ञा विवृधिषु, भविष्यति कस्मिंश्चिदागामिनि काले प्रयोगोपलब्ध-ज्ञानानां सर्वज्ञतेति नवीनमतम् । एतादृशनवीनमतानुसारेणैव बौद्धादिभिः पृथक्प्रस्थानेनोपदेशाः प्रणीताः । भारतीयराजनीतिविदां तु प्रथमः पक्ष एव रोचते । तत्र कारणं तु व्याकरणशास्त्रेणैवं प्रतिपादितम्, “रक्षोहागमलध्वसन्देहाः प्रयोजन”मिति । त्रिमुनिव्याकरणेनैव तत्संस्कृताः शब्दाः साधवोऽप्ये त्वसाधव इत्यसन्दिग्धं लघुनोपायेन संस्कृतभाषास्वरूपं लभ्यते । प्रयोगानुसारिण्या भाषया भाव्यं न तु व्याकरणनियमस्तत्रोपयुक्त इति नव्यमतानुसारेण तु भाषास्थैर्यं कथमप्यसम्भवि,



उत्तरोत्तरभाषाकाले पूर्वपूर्वभाषाज्ञानस्य लुप्यमानत्वात्पूर्वसन्दर्धानामर्थानामैतिहासिकानामस्तमयायैव कारणं स्यान्न तु सर्वज्ञतासम्पत्तये उद्देश्यभूतायै, इति भयेन भारतीयराजनीतिज्ञाः—

“शास्त्रदृष्टिगुरोर्विक्रियं तृतीयः स्वात्मनिश्चयः” ।

इत्युक्तप्रकारेण प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमशक्तिदेशकालपुरस्सरार्थसाधनविनियोग-लक्षणां क्रियामुन्नतेर्बीजमाहुः । तदेव नीतिरूपं धर्मस्य सुन्दरतमं स्वरूपम् । एतादृशशक्तिसम्पत्तिः सरस्वत्युपासकानामेव सम्भवतीति पूर्वं निर्णीतमेव । अन्येषां तु प्रयोगानुसारिणी शक्तिरुद्देश्यविपरीतत्वाद्विसंवादिनी न विस्मम्भणीयतामर्हतीति भारतीयनीतिविदां सिद्धान्तः ।

युक्तश्चायम्, व्यक्तिविषये कार्ये प्रयोगद्वारा सिद्धान्तान्वेषणे क्रियमाणे असफलप्रयोगैः पूर्वभाविभिर्नाशो व्यक्तिमात्रस्य स्यादिति इतरत्र विषये तथा प्रयोगमार्गानुसरणे कदाचिदनुज्ञार्हत्वेऽपि सर्वजनविषये राजनीतिप्रयोगे तथा मार्गानुसरणे सिद्धान्तान्वेषणात् प्रागेव सर्वराष्ट्रनाशः प्रसज्येतेत्यनर्थायैव स्यात् । तस्मात्—

“मतिमेदतमस्तिरोहिते गहने कृत्यविधौ विवेकिनाम् ।

सुकृतः परिशुद्ध आगमः कुरुते दीप इवार्थदर्शनम् ॥”<sup>१</sup>

इति पन्था एव भद्र इति भारतीयराजनीतिर्मन्यते ।

अयं च सिद्धान्तः पूर्वोत्तरपक्षमुखेन पूर्वोद्धृतैर्वाक्यैर्नयमङ्गलाकृता स्थिरीकृतः । द्वात्रिंशद्वाक्यात्मकसन्दर्भ एतावता उन्मीलितो भवति प्रायः सूक्ष्मदर्शिनामिति विस्तराद्विरम्यते ।

जयमङ्गलाग्रन्थोऽयं “अनधीतशास्त्राणां न्लेच्छानां नीतिमुपक्रम्य, अयनयबाहुल्याच्चैते शास्त्रविद्विरुद्धासीक्रियन्ते” इति पञ्चदशेन वाक्येन वर्णाश्रमहीनानां भारतीयजनपदात्कालिकोद्भासनदर्शनाद्वैद्धानां भारतवर्षतो निष्कासनकालिक इति निर्णीयते ।

यद्यपि मुद्रितपुस्तके इदं वाक्यं “अपनयबाहुल्याच्चैतेशास्त्रविद्विरुदासी-  
क्रियन्ते” इति दृश्यते, तथापि—

“इम उद्धासीकारिण इमे दुर्भूतमकन्नित्यन्यतरः ।”<sup>१</sup>

इत्यादितैत्तिरीयब्राह्मणसंवादात् “उद्धासं-निवासशून्यम्” इति तत्रत्यसायण-  
भाष्यसंवादाच्चोद्धासीक्रियन्ते इत्येव पाठः सङ्गतः, लेखकप्रमादादुदासीक्रियन्ते  
इति पाठो मुद्रितः । जयमङ्गलाकारेण स्वकीयग्रन्थेषु दण्डिकृतकाव्यादर्शस्योद्धरणत्वात्  
स दण्ड्युत्तरकालिक इति तात्कालिकीं परिस्थितिं वक्ष्यमाणरीत्या आवेदयन्  
“उद्धासीक्रियन्ते” इत्याकारक एव पाठोऽस्मदुक्तरूप एव युक्त इति भाति ।  
किम्बहुना—

“वानप्रस्थादन्यः प्रव्रजितभावः, सजातादन्यः सङ्घः, सामुत्थायिकादन्यः  
समुदायानुबन्धो वा नास्य जनपदमुपनिविशेत्” ।<sup>२</sup>

“ज्ञातिसामन्तधनिकाः क्रमेण भूमिपरिग्रहान् क्रेतुमभ्याभवेयुः” ।<sup>३</sup>

इत्यादिना जातिव्यवस्थावर्जितानां वास्तुभूमिलाभाभावव्यवस्थापनं कौटिल्यो-  
पज्ञमेव प्रवर्तते । विधानरूपेणागतस्य तस्य विषयस्य वर्तमानरूपेण निर्देशो  
जयमङ्गलाकृता क्रियमाणस्तस्य पञ्चमषष्ठशताब्दीसमाप्तकालभवत्वं सूचयति ।  
तेन प्रोक्ते पञ्चदशे वाक्ये अपनयबाहुल्यादनधीतशास्त्राणां यदुद्धासनं प्रतिपाद्यते  
तद्वैद्वीयदशरथजातकोक्तां तत्कालभवां परिस्थितिं यद्यनुमापयति तर्हि न कस्याप्यत्र  
दोषोऽनुमातुर्वक्तुर्वा वक्तुं शक्यते ।

“नचान्य आगमो लोकयात्रामुद्वहन् महाजनपरिगृहीत ईश्वरप्रणीततया  
स्मर्यमाणो दृश्यते” ।<sup>४</sup>

इति न्यायवार्तिकतात्पर्यटीकाकर्तुर्वैदिकागमविषयक उल्लेखः “कैश्चिदेव  
म्लेच्छादिभिः पुरुषापसदैः पशुप्रायैः परिग्रहाद्बोद्धव्यम्” इति ।<sup>५</sup> तदीय  
सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदुल्लेखश्चैतन्मूलभूतः श्लोकवार्तिकगतः—

१. तौ० ब्रा० १-३-६ । २. कौ० अधि० १ अ० ४ सू० । ३. कौ०  
३ अ० ९ अ० १ सू० । ४. न्या० सू० २-१-६८ व्या० । ५. सांख्यतत्त्व०  
कौ० ५ का० ।

“न चापि स्मृत्यविच्छेदात्सर्वज्ञः परिकल्प्यते ।

विगानाच्छन्नमूलत्वात्कैश्चिदेव परिग्रहात्” ॥<sup>१</sup>

इत्याद्युल्लेखश्च जयमङ्गलाकृतदुक्तमुद्रासनकारणमपनयबाहुल्यमिति विशदयति ।

क्रिस्तपूर्वषष्ठशताब्दे प्रवृत्ते सहस्रसंवत्सरव्यापिनि बौद्धकाले आयुर्वेदादिविषयान् विहाय छत्तप्रायाणां भारतीयानां कतिपयानां विद्यानां पुनरुज्जीवनं पाणिनिप्रभृतिभिः सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रैराचार्यैः कृतम् । एवंविधेऽपि बौद्धसमयेऽल्लसप्रचारमिदं नीतिशास्त्रं जयमङ्गलाकारादिभिर्बोद्धैरेव परिगृहीतं यद्वर्णयति, तदविरोध्येवार्थः उत्तरत्र कुमारिलभट्टपादशङ्करभगवत्पादादिभिः प्रतिपादित इत्येषां सर्वेषां प्राचीनग्रन्थसत्यत्वे तत्प्रतिपाद्यविषयपरिच्छेदे च स्वतःप्रामाण्याभ्युपगमे न कस्यापि विमतिरुचिता ।

एतस्मात्कारणात् राजनीतौ पुराणानामावश्यकतामुपक्षेप्तुं शब्दानामावश्यकता एतावता प्रबन्धेन निरूपिता । सा च प्रमाणशब्दमात्रस्यावश्यकत्वे स्थापिते कैमुतिकन्यायेनैव पुराणेष्वपि सिध्यति । एवं सति पुराणग्रन्थेष्वपि लेखकादिदोषवशादागतानां केषाञ्चित्प्रमादानां सकारणतया सिद्धावेव तावानंशस्ततः परिमार्ष्टुयोग्यः । अन्यथा तु आचार्यपरिगृहीतस्यार्थस्य निष्कारणतया अप्रामाण्यशङ्कनं प्रोक्ताया नीतिशक्तेरभावं शङ्कितुर्द्योतयतीति वयं प्रतीमः । शङ्कावतरणं हि नीतिशक्तेरभावात् परक्रौर्याद्वा मार्गद्वयेनैव भवति । प्रत्यभिज्ञासम्भते भारतीयराजनीत्युपबृंहिते पौराणिकैर्विशेषतः श्रीमद्भागवतेन रक्षिते धर्मे तदुभयमपि नास्ति ।

“अनर्थप्रतिभा शङ्का परक्रौर्यात्स्वदुर्नयात्” ।<sup>२</sup>

इति वचनात् ।

पूर्वोद्धृतेषु द्वात्रिंशत्सङ्ख्यकेषु जयमङ्गलावाक्येषु सर्वपदार्थस्वभावपरिच्छेदः शास्त्रं विना न सम्भवतीत्यादयो बहुविषयाः सूक्ष्मेक्षिकया आलोचनीयाः सन्ति । तानग्रे सत्यवसरे विचारयिष्यामः ।

पूर्वमुद्दिष्टेषु विषयेषु एको विषयः कथंचिदुन्मीलित इत्यधुना विस्तराद्विरमामः ।

# THE APOCRYPHAL CHARACTER OF THE EXTANT BRAHMAVAIVARTA PURAṆA

By

ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

[ पुराणानां यद्रूपमधुनोपलभ्यते तदेव तेषां प्राचीनं रूपमासीन्नवेत्यत्र विषये विप्रतिपत्तिर्वर्तते । पुराणानि खलु कालक्रमेण सकृदसकृद्वा संशोधितानि परिवर्तितानि वेति बहव आधुनिकविद्वांसो मन्यन्ते । अस्मिल्लेखे वर्तमान-ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणस्य प्राचीनत्वं मौलिकत्वं चालोचितम् । मत्स्यपुराणे ब्रह्मवैवर्त-पुराणस्य यद्वर्णनमुपलभ्यते तदनुसारि नेदं वर्तमानब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणमिति स्पष्टं प्रतीयते । यद्यप्यस्य पुराणस्य विषये 'कृष्णमाहात्म्यसंयुतम्' इति मात्स्ये कथितम्, परन्तु पद्मपुराणेन राजसपुराणेषु ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणमन्तर्भावितं, राजसनि च पुराणानि ब्रह्ममाहात्म्यपराणीति च मात्स्यं मन्यते, ब्रह्मवैवर्त-पुराणदानस्य ब्रह्मलोकप्राप्तिरूपं फलमपि च तत्रैव मात्स्ये स्कान्दे चोक्तम्, अतः प्राचीने ब्रह्मवैवर्ते 'ब्रह्मा' एव प्रधानदेव आसीत्, यस्यैव माहात्म्यं तत्र बाहुल्येनावर्तत, कृष्णमाहात्म्यमपि तस्मिन्नाधारणविषयत्वेनाविद्यत न तु प्रधानविषयत्वेनेत्युमीयते । वर्तमानब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणे तु कृष्णस्यैव प्राधान्यं वर्तते, स एव तत्र सत्यमक्षरं निर्गुणं परं ब्रह्मेति मन्यते, शिवब्रह्मादयो देवाः, लक्ष्मीसरस्वत्यादयो देव्यश्च कृष्णस्यैव आविर्भावा इत्यपि तत्र कथितम् । एशियाटिकसोसाइटी-बंगाल-सन्धि कस्यचिद् 'आदिब्रह्मवैवर्तमहापुराणस्य' द्वौ कोशौ विद्येते, तद् 'आदिब्रह्मवैवर्तमहापुराणं' तु वर्तमानब्रह्मवैवर्तमहापुराणात् सर्वथा भिद्यते—इति तयोः कोशयोः प्रदत्तानाम् अध्यायपुष्पिकाणामवलोकनेनैव प्रतीयते । पुनश्च, ख्रीस्तीयषोडशशताब्दीकाले वर्तमानैः स्मृतिचन्द्रिका-कारप्रभृतिभिर्वहुमिनिवन्धकारैः तदानीन्तनस्य ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणस्य बहवः श्लोकाः स्वनिबन्धग्रन्थेषुद्धताः, परं ते वर्तमानब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणे नैवोपलभ्यन्ते—इत्यादिभिः प्रमाणैर्वर्तमानब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणस्याप्राचीनत्वं संदिग्धप्रमाणत्वं च सूच्यते । 'दक्षिणा', 'षष्ठीदेवी', 'मङ्गलचण्डी', 'मनसादेवी' च देव्योज्ज्वलिताः तासां पूजा च विहिता, एतासां देवीनां पूजा च बंगदेशे प्रचरति, अतः बंगदेशे ब्रह्मवैवर्तपुराणमिदं रचितमासीदिति हरप्रसादशास्त्रिणोऽपि मतम् । ]

Although the Veda or Śruti has been regarded as the primary source of dharma<sup>1</sup>, yet the religion of the Hindu Society

1. *Of Manusmriti* 2. 13b—'धर्मं जिज्ञासमानानां प्रमाणं परमं श्रुतिः' ॥

has been predominantly Puranic. The Purāṇas, therefore, occupy a very important position in the whole domain of the ancient Indian literature. While the Vedas were reserved mainly for the highly intelligent and educated section of the upper classes (the dvijas) of the Hindu Society, the Purāṇas were meant for the masses. They were in fact the Veda of the laity, and in this respect they occupied a higher position even than of the Vedas<sup>1</sup>. They have been the main sources of inspiration for the religious thoughts and activities of the Hindus, and also formed the important factors in moulding the Hindu Society. But in order to retain their authoritative character, the Purāṇas had to keep pace with the vicissitudes through which the Hindu Society passed owing to the varying political, economic and religious condition of the country. So with the changes of the society the Purāṇas also underwent periodical revisions and modifications, so much so that many of the Purāṇas have lost their original form, and have become altogether new works, although retaining the same old titles. Such Purāṇas, therefore, do not present a true and genuine picture of the ancient religion and culture of India, but they give us a muddy picture of late sectarianism.

Almost every Purāṇa has been subjected to one or more revisions and editions. But there are some Purāṇas, such as Vishṇu, Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa, which have retained much of their old and genuine character; while there are some other Purāṇas which have almost lost their original form, although bearing the same old titles. The apocryphal character of such Purāṇas becomes evident on a closer study. The extant Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa is also regarded by many modern scholars as one of such apocryphal works.

Mr. H. H. Wilson, in the preface to his English translation of the Vishṇu Purāṇa remarks, 'The Brahmavaivarta has not the slightest title to be regarded as a Purāṇa.' According to him it is a sectarian work of a very late origin. M. M. Dr.

---

1. Cf. *Nāradaīya P.*, 2. 24. 17a—'वेदार्थादधिकं मन्ये पुराणार्थं वरानने ।'

Haraprasada Shastri, in his preface to the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts (Vol. V) deposited in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, remarks—"The Brahmayaiavarta Purāṇa in the present shape can not be very old.....There seems to have existed a Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa very different from the one which we now possess." Dr. R. C. Hazra is also of opinion that certain genuine Purāṇas were later on replaced by spurious works bearing the same title, and one of such works he mentions is the Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa also<sup>1</sup>. The following few facts prove the apocryphal character of the extant Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa :

1. The Matsya Purāṇa in its Adh. 53 gives the following description of the Brahmayaiavarta Purāṇa :—

रथैतस्य कल्पस्य वृत्तान्तमधिकृत्य यत् ।  
सावर्णिना नारदाय कृष्णमाहात्म्यसंयुतम् ॥  
यत्र ब्रह्मवराहस्य चरितं वर्ण्यते मुहुः ।  
तदष्टादशसाहस्रं ब्रह्मवैवर्तमुच्यते ॥

Thus, according to the Matsya Purāṇa the original Brahma-vaivarta was narrated by Sāvarṇi to Nārada, and contained the Mahātmya or glorification of Śrī-Kṛishṇa and a repeated account of Brahma-Varāha with a reference to the occurrence of the Rathantara Kalpa. The extant Brahmayaiavarta, however, says that it was narrated by Nārāyaṇa Rishi to Nārada—"नारायणविर्मगवात् प्रवदौ नारदाय च" (I. 1. 64a)<sup>2</sup>, it does not contain the account of Brahma-Varāha, and has no reference to Rathantara Kalpa. The absence of these important characteristics, which have been mentioned by such old authority as the Matsya Purāṇa, and the predominance in it of the glorification of Rādhā and Kṛishṇa prove its apocryphal character, and make it a work of some later age when the cult of the bhakti of Rādhā-Kṛishṇa

1. Cf. Dr. R. C. Hazra's article 'Studies in the genuine Āgneya Purāṇa' published in 'Our Heritage' Vol. I (1953) pp. 210-245.

2. All the references of the Brahmayaiavarta Purāṇa have been given here from its Anandāśrama edition.

had great influence in the Hindu Society, specially among the Hindus of the eastern districts of India where the extant Brahmayaiivarta Purāṇa seems to have been composed<sup>1</sup>.

2. The Matsya divides the Purāṇas into four categories as follows :—

सात्त्विकेषु पुराणेषु माहात्म्यमधिकं हरेः ।  
 राजसेषु च माहात्म्यमधिकं ब्रह्मणो विदुः ॥  
 तद्बदन्नेश्व माहात्म्यं तामसेषु शिवस्य च ।  
 संकीर्णेषु सरस्वत्याः पितृणां च निगद्यते ॥

(53. 68-69)

Thus the sāttvika Purāṇas predominantly glorify Hari or Vishnu, the rājasa glorify Brahmā, the tāmasa glorify Śiva, and the saṁskṛta or composite glorify Sarasvatī and the Pitṛis. The Padma Purāṇa places the Brahmayaiivarta among the rājasa Purāṇas which according to the Matsya belong to the Brahmā-cult :—

ब्रह्माण्डं ब्रह्मवैवर्तं मार्कण्डेयं तथैव च ।  
 अविष्यं वामनं ब्राह्मं राजसानि निषोष मे ॥

(An. ed., Uttara Khaṇḍa, 264. 34)

So, according to the Padma Purāṇa the Brahmayaiivarta is a rājasa Purāṇa having Brahmā as its highest deity; and according to the Śiva-rahasya Khaṇḍa of the Śaṅkara-Saṁhitā of the Skanda Purāṇa (Chap. 2. verses 30-5) the Sun (Savitṛi)

1. The extant Brahmayaiivarta Purāṇa mentions the names of certain goddesses, such as Shashthī Devī, Maṅgalachandīkī, Mīnastī (or Mānastī Devī) and Dakṣiṇī (see *Prakṛti Khaṇḍa*, 4.8), and contains their upākhyānas and Stotras etc. (*Ibid.*, Adhyāyas 42-46). These goddesses are worshipped mainly in the eastern districts of India. This Purāṇa also enjoins the worship of Goddess Sarasvatī on the fifth day of the bright half of the month of Mīgha. (*Ibid.*, 4, 83 ff.), which is still prevalent in Bengal. Again, this Purāṇa mentions certain mixed castes, such as Jolā and Vaidya etc. (Brahmakhaṇḍa, Adh. 10, śl. 121, 123) which are found only in Bengal.

is its highest deity<sup>1</sup>. All this show that Kṛishṇa was not the main deity of the original Brahma-Vaivarta. But in the extant Brahma-Vaivarta Śrī-Kṛishṇa with his consort Rādhā is the supreme deity from the beginning to the end.

The present BV. Purāṇa is divided into four Khaṇḍas :—  
 (1) Brahma-Khaṇḍa, (2) Prakṛiti-Khaṇḍa, (3) Gaṇeśa-Khaṇḍa and (4) Śrī-Kṛishṇa-Janma-Khaṇḍa. Some meagre account of Brahmā is contained in the Brahma-Khaṇḍa only and there also he has been subordinated to Śrī-Kṛishṇa. This Khaṇḍa contains only 30 chapters, whereas the Śrīkṛishṇa-Janma-khaṇḍa, which constitutes the main bulk of this Purāṇa, contains 133 chapters. It is clearly the work of the Bhāgavata-Vaiṣṇavas who joined hands with the Śaivas to overshadow the cult of Brahmā-worshippers, and they might have also modified or completely changed the genuine Brahma-vaivarta to propagate their own views. Śiva is generally regarded as tāmasa, and the Matsyu Purāṇa also says that tāmasa Purāṇas are those which mainly glorify Śiva ; but the present Brahma-vaivarta says that both Viṣṇu and Śiva are sāttvika, and only the ignorant fools regard Śiva as tāmasa—

राजसस्य स्वयं ब्रह्मा शिवो विष्णुश्च सात्त्विकौ ॥

परमज्ञानिनो मूर्खान् वदन्ति तामसं शिवम् ॥

(Brahma-khaṇḍa, 8. 20b, 21b)

Thus the genuine Brahma-vaivarta, a work of the Brahmā-worshippers, has been superseded by the extant Brahma-vaivarta through the combined efforts of the Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas. It is on this account that it, being a Vaiṣṇava work, exhibits a spirit of religious toleration towards the Śaivas also.

The present Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa (Ān. ed.) contains four khaṇḍas, as has been said before. Following the footsteps of Śāimad Bhāgavata (which also has Śrīkṛishṇa as its main

1. See J. Eggeling, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, VI, Nos. 2671-2, p. 1368, referred to by R.C. Hazare, *op. cit.* p. 210, l.n. 4.



Deity, and which divides its tenth Skandha into Pūrvārdha and Uttarārdha) it also divides its Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Janma-Khaṇḍa into Pūrvārdha and Uttarārdha. Moreover, like the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa it also attributes ten characteristics (lakṣhaṇas) instead of the famous pañcha lakṣhaṇas, to the Mahāpurāṇas, and remarks that the five lakṣhaṇas (viz. Sarga, Pratisarga, Vamśa, Manvantaras, and Vamśānucharita) belong to the Upapurāṇas (cf. Bhāg. XII. 7. 9-10 ; and BV. IV. 12. 6-11)

Although the original Brahma-vaivarta, according to the Matsya and some other Purāṇas, contained Kṛṣṇa-māhātmya as its special topic, yet this māhātmya might not have been the main topic there, as is the case with the extant Brahma-vaivarta, because the original Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa has been regarded as a rājasa Purāṇa with Brahmā as its principal Deity.

In the present Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa Kṛṣṇa has been regarded as the Absolute Brahman, the Unconditioned Supreme Being beyond Prakṛiti, residing in the Goloka with the Rādhā and the cowherds, in the form of a young Gopa with two hands and with a flute in his hands (L. 12. 64-65), whom the Vaiṣṇavas meditate upon (L. 2). Vaiṣṇavas have been praised as great Yogis and saints (L. 1. 48), even a sinner gets salvation by a mere touch of a Vaiṣṇava follower (‘वैष्णवस्पर्शमात्रेण मुक्तो भवति पातकी’ IV. 1. 65). A Vaiṣṇava Chāṇḍālā is superior to a non-Vaiṣṇava Brāhmaṇa (‘अवैष्णवाद् द्विजाद् विप्र चण्डालो वैष्णवो बरः’ I. 11. 39). It should be noted that the word ‘Vaiṣṇava’ here is not a general term for a devotee of God, for this Purāṇa is very explicit in defining a Vaiṣṇava—only that man is to be called ‘Vaiṣṇava’ who belongs to the Vaiṣṇava sect, and who has been duly initiated by a guru into the Vaiṣṇava fold by imparting him the Viṣṇu-mantra ; such an initiated Vaiṣṇava is extremely pure and jīvan-mukta (L. 11. 41, 42), and he certainly attains Goloka (L. 12. 23).

Thus the ancient Brahma-vaivarta of the Brahmā-cult has been superseded by the extant Brahma-vaivarta of the Vaiṣṇava-cult.

3. That the genuine *Brahma-vaivarta* was originally a work of the *Brahmā*-cult, and not of the *Vaiṣṇava* cult, is also indicated by the following statement of the *Matsya* and the *Skanda Purāṇa* :—

पुराणं ब्रह्मवैवर्तं यो दद्यान्मावमासि च ।

वैर्णमास्यां शुभदिने ब्रह्मलोके महीयते ॥

(*Matsya*, 53. 35)

पुराणं ब्रह्मवैवर्तं यो दद्याद् ब्राह्मणोत्तमे ।

मावमासे वैर्णमास्यां ब्रह्मलोके महीयते ॥

(*Skanda*, 7. 1. 2. 53)

Thus a person who gives a copy of the *Brahmavaivarta* to a worthy *Brahmaṇa* is said to attain the *Brahma-loka* (the region of *Brahmā*). The *Saura Purāṇa* (9. 27) also makes the similar statement. But according to the present *BV. Purāṇa* *Brahma-loka* is far inferior to *Goloka* and is never the goal of the worshippers of *Kṛishṇa* who unfailingly attain the *Goloka*, the eternal abode of supreme bliss :—

यत्पुष्पवाग्देनेनैव ब्रह्मणः पतनं भवेत् ।

तद् ब्रह्मत्वं स्वप्नस्तुल्यं कृष्णभक्तो न चेच्छति ॥

(I. 12. 33)

...कृष्णभक्तश्च गोलोकं याति निश्चितम् ॥

(I. 14, 58)

4. The ancient *Purāṇic* literature contains little of *tāntrika* element which has definitely an independent origin and growth. But the extant *BV. Purāṇa* abounds in *tāntricism*; its *Prakṛiti-khaṇḍa* and *Gaṇeśa-khaṇḍa* are specially full of *tāntric kavachas*, *bijas*, and *Pañjā-vidhis*. This *tāntric* element incorporated into the body of its text clearly proves the late origin or the total revision of the extant *Brahma-vaivarta*. On account of this *tāntric* element the *Brahma-vaivarta*, as it is available today, loses much of its genuine character.

5. A number of Nibandha-works (such as Smṛiti-Chandrikā, Hemādri's Chaturvarga-Chīntāmaṇi, Kāla-nirṇaya, Kāla-sāra, Raghunandana's Smṛiti-tattva, Haribhakti-vilāsa etc.) belonging to the sixteenth century A. D. have drawn upon a Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa. About 1500 lines of that Brahma-vaivarta have been quoted in these works, but only 30 of these lines are found in the extant Brahma-vaivarta (in its IV khaṇḍa). The absence of the remaining lines in the present Brahma-vaivarta shows that it was not the work from which those Nibandhakāras quoted in their works. So this Brahma-vaivarta was not known even to the Nibandhakāras of the sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup> This proves its apocryphal character.

6. In vol. V of the Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal are mentioned two Devanāgarī Mss. of the Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa—Nos. 3820 and 3821, both of which are fragmentary and incomplete. Both these Mss. begin from Adh. 29. Ms. No. 3820 contains 55 folios only, while Ms. 3821 has 113 folios, and is comparatively older. Some of their chapter-colophons show that both these Mss. belong to a different Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa called 'Ādi Brahma-vaivarta Mahāpurāṇa' which was quite different from the extant Brahma-vaivarta<sup>2</sup> (Ān. and Vaṅgavāst

1. cf. Hazra's *Paurāṇic Records*, P. 100.

2. The chapter-colophons of Ms. No. 3821, as quoted in the above Catalogue, are given below, so that the difference between the Ādi and the extant Brahma-vaivarta may be clearly seen :—

Folio 4 A—इति श्रीमहापुराणे ब्रह्मवैवर्ते क्रोधप्रथमोपायनिरूपणे पराशरोपाख्याने एकौनत्रिंशत्तमोऽध्यायः (Same also in Ms. 3820, folio 3 A—इत्यादि महापुराणे ब्रह्मवैवर्ते०); 6 A—० ब्रह्मवैवर्तस्थे प्रतिसर्गांश्चे द्याप्रशंसार्त्ता वसिष्ठगीतास्तु त्रिंशत्तमोऽध्यायः; 13 A—योगप्रशंसानामाध्यायः; 18B—इत्यादि महापुराणे ब्रह्मवैवर्ते भृगुमन्दप्रतिप्राप्तादिसामान्यधर्मकथनं नाम त्रयविंशोऽध्यायः; 28B—इति श्री० प्रतिसर्गांश्चे व्यासशुक्लसंवादे षट्सु रूपदेशो नाम षट्त्रिंशोऽध्यायः (Same also in Ms. No. 3820, folio 16B—इत्यादि महापुराणे०); 31A—इति श्री० प्रतिसर्गांश्चे विद्योपदेशाधिकरणनिरूपणं नाम सप्तत्रिंशत्तमोऽध्यायः; 37 A—इति श्री० अष्टममहावासरः समाप्तः; 39 A—इत्यादि महापुराणे एकदशीमाहात्म्यं चत्वारिंशोऽध्यायः; 45 A—० विशत्यवतारितं नाम द्वाचत्वारिंशत्तमो-

editions both). This Ādi Brahma-vaivarta Mahāpurāṇa contained very little account of Kṛishṇa and his Prakṛitis. Its chapters 29th and 30th contained पराशरोपाख्यान and वसिष्ठगीता respectively :—

इत्यादिमहापुराणे ब्रह्मवैवर्ते कोषप्रथमनोपायनिरूपणे

पराशरोपाख्याने एकोनत्रिंशत्तमोऽध्यायः । (Both Mss.)

इति श्रीमहापुराणे ब्रह्मवैवर्तख्ये प्रतिसर्गांशे द्वाप्रश्नोपाख्याने

वसिष्ठगीतासु त्रिंशत्तमोऽध्यायः । (Ms. 3821)

But the corresponding chapters in the extant Brahma-vaivarta are quite different and do not at all contain these topics, they contain श्रीकृष्णमाहात्म्यवर्णन and भगवत्स्तुतिवर्णन respectively. The Ādi Brahma-vaivarta Mahā-Purāṇa differed from the extant Brahma-vaivarta in several other respects also, which a perusal of its chapter-colophons, as given in the above mentioned Descriptive Catalogue, will show.<sup>1</sup> It seems that it was not divided into separate Khaṇḍas as the extant Brahma-vaivarta is, but contained continuous chapters. Its extent was also much less. The Nāradya Mahāpurāṇa was not in the know of such a Brahma-vaivarta, because it mentions the same four Khaṇḍas of the Brahma-vaivarta, which the extant Brahma-vaivarta contains. So the Ādi Brahma-vaivarta of the above mentioned Mss. might be more ancient than the present Nāradya Mahāpurāṇa.<sup>2</sup>

ऽध्यायः ; 49 B—कालस्वप्ननामाध्यायः ; 52 A—कालस्वप्नवर्णने कालखण्डकीप्रवृत्त-  
नाम स्तुः कथारिखण्डोऽध्यायः ; 55 A—पतिवतोपाख्याने पदस्वप्नारिखण्डोऽध्यायः ;  
55 B—पतिवतोपाख्याने तापसधर्मव्याख्यानं ४० अध्यायः ; 58 B—जलोपाख्याने ४८  
अध्यायः ; 68 A—नरकवृत्तिवर्णनं नाम ५२ अध्यायः ; 80 A—वृत्तत्रयोत्पत्तिर्नामाध्यायः ;  
84 A—प्रभृष्टांशोपाख्यानप्रवृत्त नाम सर्गः ; 91 A—गोदानमाहात्म्यं खानकालनिर्णयो नाम  
सर्गः ; 92 B—त्रिव्याधिपिनाम सर्गः ; 107 B—कृष्णगीता कृष्णवर्णितं नामाध्यायः ;  
113—इत्यादि महापुराणे ब्रह्मवैवर्ते अष्टोत्पत्तिः श्रीजन्माध्यायः ।

1. See fn. 2 on p. 99 above.

2. The antiquity of this Ādi Brahma-vaivarta Mahāpurāṇa may also be inferred from the following facts :—

The Ādi BV. mentions twenty Avatars of Viṣṇu in its Adhyāya 42 (see fn. 2, p. 99 above), like the Bhāgavata which also mentions about the same number of Avatars in I. 3, II. 7 and IV. 8. But in the *Daśavatara-Stotra* of Kāśhemiṇḍra

7. The Nāradya Mahāpurāṇa (Pūrva Khaṇḍa, Adh. 101) gives the same characteristics and extent of the Brahma-vaivarta as given in the other Purāṇas. In almost all the Purāṇas which give the list of the eighteen Mahā Purāṇas, the extent of the Brahma-vaivarta is given as 18,000 ślokas. But the Anandāśrama and the Vāṅga-vāsī editions of the Brahma-vaivarta contain more than 22,000 ślokas, and the Venktesvara edition contains about 25,000 ślokas. So the extant Brahma-vaivarta contains about 5,000 ślokas as later additions; and its remaining portion is also a completely revised work.<sup>1</sup>

In short, the extant Brahma-vaivarta Purāṇa is not the same work as described by the Matsya and the other Purāṇas. It is a revised, enlarged and totally changed work, and is most probably an apocryphal work of the Bhāgavatas or Kṛishṇa-worshippers, compiled in the eastern part of India (specially in Bengal), and perhaps in the early Muhammadan period of Indian history.<sup>2</sup>

(11th century A.D.) and in the Vishṇupura-Cards (7th or 8th century A.D.) the number of Avatāras is given as ten. The larger number of Avatāras given in a work often indicates its older date. So the Ādi BV, must belong to the same antiquity as the Bhāg, i. e. to the time before the Vishṇupura-Cards, or to the Gupta Period. (Vide also H. P. Shastri's preface to his D. C., Vol. V, pp. LXXXVII, CLX).

Again, the Ādi BV. contains a chapter on the Ākhyāyikās of six Gurus (षट्गुरुरूपदेशो नाम षट्त्रिंशोऽध्यायः, f.n. 2, p. 99 above). Although these stories are referred to in the Ākhyāyikā-Adhyāya (IV) of the Sāṅkhya-Sūtra (Sutras 1, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14), but they are really based on a much more ancient work of Sāṅkhya philosophy, viz. the *Shashiti-tantra* of Pañchadīkha, which also contained these and other Ākhyāyikās (cf. Īśvara Kṛishṇa's *Sāṅkhya-Kārikā*, 79). So this Ādi BV. must have been an old work. (Cf. also H. P. Shastri, *op. cit.*, preface, p. clx)

1. cf. H. P. Shastri, *op. cit.*, preface, p. clvi.

2. The extant Bv. Purāṇa contains also the description of the Mlecchhas as follows :—

अविद्धकर्णाः शूराश्च निर्भया रणदुर्जयाः ।

शौचाचारविहीनाश्च दुर्धर्मा धर्मवर्जिताः ॥

(Brahmakhaṇḍa, 10, 140)

Surely, the Mlecchhas referred to here are no others than the Muhammadans, for the mixed caste Jola, which is said to have been produced by a Mlecchha in a Kuvinda (weaver) girl (‘म्लेच्छस्तुतिन्दकस्यायां जोलाजातिर्भव च’ I. 10, 121a), is still considered a Muhammadan caste in Bengal.

# प्रह्लादचरित-समालोचनम्

( श्री अनन्तकृष्णशास्त्री )

[The Prahlāda-charita is a very famous Puranic story, and is found in the majority of the Mahāpurāṇas, in some of the Upapurāṇas, such as the Nṛsiṃha and the Saura, and also in the Mahābhārata. The learned writer presents here a comparative and critical study of the Prahlāda-Charita.]

The Prahlāda-Charita may be divided into two parts— (1) beginning from the childhood of Prahlāda upto the killing of his father, Hiranya-kaśipu, by Nṛsiṃha, and (2) from the enthronement of Prahlāda as the King of the Daityas and the Dānavas after the death of Hiranyakaśipu, upto the time of his Nirvāṇa, this period also comprising Prahlāda's two pilgrimages and his two fights with the Devas. The stories of both these parts have different versions in different Purāṇas. While all the Purāṇas agree in the fact that Hiranya-kaśipu was killed by Nṛsiṃha, they differ as regards the details of Prahlāda's life both before and after the death of Hiranyakaśipu, e. g. the Karma Purāṇa and the Saura Purāṇa mention the fight of Prahlāda with Nṛsiṃha before the death of Hiranyakaśipu, which goes against the version of the Vishṇu and the Bhāgavata. Similarly the Vāmana Purāṇa mentions Prahlāda's two pilgrimages and also his fights with the gods, but the Devībhāgavata says that Prahlāda went on one pilgrimage only.

The author has tried to reconcile all such varying and contradictory statements of the various Purāṇas. In certain places he has tried to remove such contradictions in the traditional Puranic way, i. e. by assigning different versions of the story to different Kalpas.]

सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।

वंशानुचरितं चैव पुराणं पंचलक्षणम् ॥

इति पुराणलक्षणेषु मन्वन्तरतदनुचरितप्रस्तावे, तत्रापि भागवतासुर-वंशचरित-प्रसङ्गे प्रह्लादचरितं तत्र तत्र प्रस्तूयते ।' तत्र तदीयचरितोपक्रमः, तदीय-जन्मत आरभ्य यावत्तत्पितृहिरण्यकशिपुवधं नृसिंहपुराण उपपुराणान्तर्गते, तदीय-विद्याभ्यासमुपक्रम्य आहिरण्यकशिपुवधं कूर्मपुराणे, श्रीमद्भागवते, विष्णुपुराणे च महापुराणे; उपपुराणे च सौरादौ तु तदीयराज्यशासनपद्धतिरपि; ततो देवासुरयुद्धो-परतिपर्यन्तं तस्य तपोविशेषः, तस्य नृसिंहमन्त्रेण नृसिंहावधनम्, तत्पौत्राय बल्ये दत्ताय शापप्रदानम्, ततः पश्चात्तसाय तत्कर्तव्योपदेशः, तस्येन्द्रादिभिः साकं संवादः, अन्ततो द्विजवेषेण स्वशुश्रूषवे तस्मै तदभीप्सितवरदानम्, ततस्तत्पार्थनाऽ-नुसारं स्वोत्कर्षनिदानस्वशीलवितरणम्, ततस्तच्छरीरात्तच्छील-धर्म-राज्यलक्ष्म्यादि-निर्गमः, अन्ते भगवदाज्ञया मुक्तिश्च तच्चरितानुक्रमेण वामनपुराणे, मत्स्यपुराणे, देवीभागवते, महामारते च विस्तरेण दृश्यते ।

तत्र हिरण्यकशिपुवधान्तकथान्तसंदर्भेषु<sup>१</sup> कूर्मपुराणम् 'नृसिंहेन साकं प्रथमतः प्रह्लादस्य युद्धमासीत्, यदा ब्रह्मास्त्रं प्रह्लादेन नृसिंहं प्रति, नृसिंहेन तु नारायणस्त्रं प्रह्लादं प्रति च प्रक्षिप्तम्' इत्यादिना श्रीमद्भागवतकथासन्दर्भविरुद्धमनुक्रमते । नृसिंहपुराणम्, विष्णुपुराणम् च हिरण्यकशिपुना पित्रा बहु शिक्षितोऽपि प्रह्लादो भगवति स्वीयं भक्त्यतिशयं नाजहात्, न वा तदीया काऽपि शिक्षा तं प्रति

१—पूर्वजन्मनि प्रह्लादः सोमशर्मा नाम कश्चिन्महात् तपस्वी आसीत्, स मरणकाले वैत्यमीतिषाधितत्वात् प्रह्लादो भूत्वा हिरण्यकशिपुर्दैत्यकुले संजात इत्यादि प्रह्लादस्य पूर्व-जन्मवृत्तान्तं तु पद्मपुराणे (आनन्दाश्रम०), भूमिखण्डे, पद्मसेऽध्याये (श्लो० ८-१३) द्रष्टव्यम् ।

२—महामारते शान्तिपर्वणि १२४ तमेऽध्याये प्रस्तूयते—प्रह्लादेनेन्द्राय तत्प्रविधमागत्य बहुतरं परिचरणेन तदुपासनेन च संतुष्टेनेन्द्रप्राप्तं नाममुत्तमं स्वीयं सर्वस्वं वितीर्णम्, ततस्तु शीलाञ्जवन्धिनी इत्तम्, धर्मः, राज्यलक्ष्मीप्रभृतयः सर्वेऽपि तदीयाः पुरंदरमेवेन्द्रमधिगत्य तद्वैद्यं यावद्वैद्यस्वतमन्वन्तरं स्वैर्यमलमन्त-इति ।

३—हिरण्यकशिपुवधान्तकथासंदर्भानुबन्धीनि पुराणानिः—मत्स्य पु०, कूर्म पु०, पद्म पु०, वृषिपु०, विष्णुपु०, भागवतपु०, देवीभागवतपु०, स्कन्दपु०, लिङ्गपु०, सौरपु०, हरिवंशपु०, योगवासिष्ठम्, हरिमहिम्नोदयम् ।

प्रयुक्ता सफलैति दृष्ट्वा विस्मितो हिरण्यकशिपुः प्रह्लादं शिरस्याघ्राय आलिङ्ग्य, प्रेम्णा पुत्रभावेन तमङ्गे निक्षिप्य च प्रह्लादेन साकं यथापूर्वं राज्यशासनमकरोत् । अन्ततस्त्वक्स्मान् नृसिंहेन हतो हिरण्यकशिपुरिति प्रस्तौति । श्रीमद्भागवते च स्तम्भादाविर्भूय, विनैव विलम्बं नृसिंहेन हिरण्यकशिपुर्हृत इति ।

तत्रैकमत्यं नृसिंहेन हिरण्यकशिपोर्वधे सत्यमस्ति, परं तु कथं तत् ? कथं चैकवाक्यता, सर्वेषां पुराणानामत्रविरोधपरिहारो वेति विमर्शनीयम् ।

राज्यशासनकाले वामनपुराणे द्विवारं तीर्थयात्रा प्रह्लादस्य वर्णिता, देवी-भागवते तु सकृत् । वामनपुराणे प्रथमतीर्थयात्रायां प्रह्लादस्य नरनारायणाभ्यां युद्धमुपवर्णितम् । अनन्तरं तु राज्यमन्धके स्वपितृव्यपुत्रे निक्षिप्य साक्षाद् राज्यशासनाधिकारात् प्रह्लाद उपरामेति श्रूयते । देवीभागवते तु बलिचक्रवर्तिनः षट्पञ्चकपर्यन्तं प्रह्लादस्य राज्यशासनमासीदिति वर्ण्यते । अन्धकराज्यकाले देवैः साकं प्रह्लादादीनां युद्धमासीत् । तत्र तु प्रह्लादादीनां जय एवासीत्, कदाऽपि न पराजय इति श्रूयते । देवीभागवते तु देवैः साकं युद्धे प्रह्लादादीनां पराजयो वर्ण्यते ! तदा बलिशासनकालेऽपि बलिसविधभागस्य प्रह्लादस्तं बहुधोपदिदेशेति च । द्वितीययात्रायां कुरुक्षेत्रे प्रह्लादस्य पुरतो बलेरश्वमेधा-नुष्ठानम्, यदा वामनेन पदत्रयथाचनं कृतमिति वामनपुराणेऽनुक्रम्यते । तत्र सर्वदा द्वितीययात्रासमये प्रह्लादेन गजेन्द्रमोक्षस्तोत्रम्, सारस्वतस्तोत्रम्, सर्वपापशमनस्तोत्र-द्वयं च जप्यमानमासीदिति वामनपुराणं कथयति । नृसिंहावतारात् पूर्वं विष्णुपुराणतः प्रतिशिक्षावसानं प्रह्लादकृतानि बहूनि स्तोत्राणि दृश्यन्ते । नृसिंहावतारप्रकरणमेव न तत्र प्रक्रियते, न वा नृसिंहस्तुतिस्तदा प्रह्लादेन कृता विष्णुपुराणे । श्रीमद्भागवते तु न प्रतिशिक्षावसानं प्रह्लादद्वारा भगवतः स्तुतिः प्रस्तूयते, किन्तु नृसिंहावतारा-नन्तरमेवातिगभीरार्थबहुला प्रह्लादस्य स्तुतिरान्नायते ।

नृसिंहपुराणं अष्टषष्ठ्यध्यायात्मकं दशावतारान् विस्तरेणानुवर्णयद्यपि नृसिंहावतारं हिरण्यकशिपुवधपर्यन्तं श्रीमद्विष्णुपुराणश्रीमद्भागवतादिपुराणार्थ-संकल्पनेन तत्तत्पुराणप्रस्तुतं परस्परविरुद्धकथासन्दर्भं विरोधपरिहारेणावतारयति । अत्र एकचत्वारिंशत्तमेध्याये हिरण्यकशिपोः प्राप्तत्रैलोक्यराज्याधिपत्यस्य बन्धुभिर-न्यैश्चावगुणशकुनशतदर्शनेन वारितस्यापि कैलासगिरिं प्रति भगवन्तं गिरिजापति-



मुद्दिश्यापरिमितवरप्राप्तये तपश्चर्यार्थं गमनम्, तेन चतुर्मुखस्य ब्रह्मणो महती चिन्ता, नारदेन तदाश्वासनानन्तरं सपर्वतेन हिरण्यकशिपुसविध उपसर्पणम्, तस्य पुरतः कलविक्कपक्षिरूपेण शाखाग्रेऽवस्थाय “ॐ नमो नारायणाय” इत्युच्चैरुच्चारणम्, तयोर्वधार्थं हिरण्यकशिपोर्वाणक्षेपार्थमुद्यमः, तत उड्डीय ततोऽन्यत्र गमनेन ताभ्यामात्मसंरक्षणम्, ततः कुपितस्य हिरण्यकशिपोः स्वावासं प्रति निवर्तनम्, तदावासं गतस्य तस्य कथाधूसमाख्यया पतिव्रतया तत्पत्न्या “वर्षाणामयुतं तपः करिष्ये” इति संकल्प्य दृढेन व्रतेन तपोऽर्थं गतस्य भवतस्तद्व्रतपूर्तिं विनैव कथमत्रागमनमिति प्रश्नः, तेन तस्या यथावत्कलविड्ककृतभगवन्नामसंकीर्तनश्रवणजनितक्रोधवशेन तपोविघ्नवृत्तान्तवर्णनम्। ततः प्राप्त ऋतुकाले तद्द्वारा तस्या गर्भधारणम्, ततो भागवतशिरोमणेः प्रह्लादस्य जन्म, बाल्याद् आरभ्यैव तेन सर्वत्र भगवद्भक्तिमार्गस्थोत्कृष्टत्वश्रेयःसाधनत्वादिना प्रचारः, सततं बाल्यावस्थायामपि तस्य भगवद्गुणगणानुसन्धानैकदृष्टिः, गुरुवेश्मगतस्य तस्य मात्रा पितृसविधे प्रशस्यमानस्य गुरुगृहादानीतस्य गुरुगृहादधीतांशविशेषवर्णनार्थं हिरण्यकशिपुना नियोगः, ततस्तेन भगवन्नामसंकीर्तनमाहात्म्यस्य सूक्ष्मस्य भगवत्तत्त्वस्य च तत्सविधे निवेदनम्, सहासं संक्रुद्धेन हिरण्यकशिपुना रामगोविन्दादिनामसंकीर्तनमस्मद्वैरिणां कृत्यं नास्मदीयानाम्, इति तत उपरमणमेव श्रेय इत्युपदेशः, हिरण्यकशिपोरपि तन्नामसंकीर्तनमेव परमं श्रेय इति प्रह्लादेनोद्बोधनम्, धिग्धिगिति पराकृत्य स्वगुरुसविधे स्वकुलोचितधर्मोपदेशार्थं रामनामादिसंकीर्तनवैमुख्यार्थं च हिरण्यकशिपुना नियोगः, प्रह्लादरक्षणस्य स्वशरणागतिमात्रनिबन्धनत्वम्, नान्यशरणागत्यधीनत्वम् इति यथानिर्दिष्टम् शिक्षणार्थं गुरुकुलवासं प्रति प्रेषणम्, तत्प्रसङ्गेन प्रह्लादस्य कौमारावस्थायामपि बालक्रीडाद्यवसरेऽपि भगवच्चरितानुसन्धानैकदृष्टिश्च विस्तरेण वर्णिता ।

अथ सांप्रतं हिरण्यकशिपुवधानन्तरं शासकपदमधिष्ठितवतः प्रह्लादस्य राज्यशासनप्रणालीम्, तदीयतीर्थयात्रादिकम्, तदीयशीलवृत्तधर्मादिसर्वतेजोनिर्गमपर्यन्तान् तदीयकथासन्दर्भान् वामन-देवीभागवत-मात्स्यानुसारेण समालोचयामः । इदं हि सर्वं नान्तरा वामनपुराणं देवीभागवतम् मात्स्यं वाऽन्यत्र कुत्राप्युपलभ्यते ।

इदं युद्धं तीर्थयात्रां समाप्य स्वावासं प्रति प्रह्लादस्यागमनानन्तम् तत्र प्रथम-तीर्थयात्रायां नैमिषारण्यमेव प्रथमं प्रह्लादो गत इति वामनपुराणमिव देवी-

भागवतमपि प्रस्तौति । तत्र प्रायेण वामनपुराणे सप्तमाध्यायगता एव श्लोकाः, देवीभागवतेऽप्यष्टमाध्याये दृश्यन्ते । उभयत्रापि च्यवनोपदेशानुसारमेव नैमिषारण्ययात्रा प्रह्लादस्य । तत्र वामनपुराणं सप्तमाध्यायेन तद्यात्रां वर्णयति देवीभागवतं तु तत्रैव एकचत्वारिंशत्तमश्लोकमारभ्य तामनुक्रमते । तत्र देवामुरयुद्धे वामनपुराणप्रस्तुते दैत्यानां जयः । तत्र प्रथमे युद्धे वामनपुराणीये प्रह्लादस्याप्यनुमतिरासीत् । देवीभागवते तु न तत्प्रह्लादोऽन्वमन्यत । तथा देवीभागवते शुकस्य तपस्यार्थं गतस्य वेषेण बृहस्पतिना दैत्या विपरीतं नास्तिक-पथेनोद्दिष्टाः । तपस्यातः परावृत्तं स्वगुरुमपि ते न श्रद्धुः । तस्य क्रुद्धस्य शापार्थं प्रस्तुतस्य चाश्वासनार्थं प्रह्लादस्य तदनुनयनम्, तदुपचरणादिकं चात्रानुसन्धानमर्हति । मत्स्यपुराणमपि ४७ तमेऽध्याये देवीभागवतमेवात्रानुसूते । तत्र वामनपुराणवर्णिते बलिना साकं देवानां युद्धेऽपि दैत्यानामेव जयः । तत्र च प्रह्लादेन बल्यादयोऽभिषिक्ता इति कथासन्दर्भोऽप्यनुसन्धेयः ।

अत्र देवीभागवतदृष्ट्या द्वितीयं युद्धं तु बलेर्वामनाज्ञया रसातलशासनकाले, प्रथमं वामनावतारात्पूर्वमेव वामनपुराणनिर्दिष्टम्, यन्निमित्त एव वामनावतारः । देवामुरयुद्धनित्यं प्रह्लादशासनोपदेशकाले, तत्र च युद्धद्वये देवानां पराजयः, एकत्र दैत्यानां सः, सोऽपि बृहस्पतेः शुकवेषधारिणो वञ्चनमात्रेण ।

हिरण्यकशिपुवधान्तकथा सन्दर्भेण सर्वपुराणैकवाक्यताऽनुगुणेन प्रह्लादस्य भगवति नारायणं भक्त्यतिशयः, भगवद्भक्त्यविरोधेनैव पितृवाक्यपरिपालनं धर्मः, अन्यथा तु तदाज्ञापरिपालनमधर्म एव ।

हिरण्यकशिपुवधानन्तरकथासन्दर्भे प्रह्लादराज्यशासनपद्धतिः, तदीयतीर्थ-यात्रादिकम्, तदीयराज्यशासननियममनुसृत्य भगवद्भक्त्यविरोधेन स्वधर्माविरोधेन क्षत्रियाणामिवाभिषिक्तानां स्वधर्मयुद्धादिना त्रैलोक्यशासनाधिकारार्थं तदा तदा प्रह्लादस्य युद्धमपि देवैः साकमभूत् । प्रह्लादस्तु विष्णुभक्तोऽपि शिवमपि तदा तदा स्वधर्माविरोधेन भजन्नासीदिति वामनपुराणादवगम्यते, यदेव प्रायेण देवीभागवतेऽप्यनुक्रम्यते ।

अवान्तरस्तु कश्चन विशेषस्तदीयचरिते वामनपुराणे देवीभागवतादवगम्य-मानोऽपि न परमार्थगत्या विरुध्यते ।

इदमत्रानुसन्धेयम्—वामनपुराणं त्रैलोक्यशासनावसरेऽन्धकासुरस्य स्वपितृ-  
व्यहिरण्याक्षपुत्रस्य, साक्षात्तत्पुराणगतकथासन्दर्भाणां परस्परविरुद्धानामिव  
प्रतीयमानानामेकवाक्यतया योजनं सुष्ठु करोति । स हि पाद्मकल्पानुसारी  
प्रह्लादचरितं संगृह्णाति । प्रह्लादचरितं सर्वेषु कल्पेषु वैवस्वतमन्वन्तरे  
प्रवृत्तमिति सर्वाणि पुराणान्यैककण्ठ्येन वर्णयन्ति । प्रह्लादचरितमिदं वैवस्वत-  
मन्वन्तरे एवेति वामनदेवीभागवतादिपुराणसमालोचनेन विशदीभवति ॥

नृसिंहपुराणं तु—विष्णुपुराणवत् प्रह्लादस्य नागपाशवद्धस्य हिरण्यकशिपुना  
रात्रौ रहसि समुद्रे प्रक्षेपाणार्थमाज्ञापनम्, तथा समुद्रे पातितस्य भागवतप्रवरस्य  
भगवत्स्वरूपानुसन्धानैकदीक्षितस्य तद्ब्रह्माभृतसागरमग्नस्य भगवता वरुणालयेन  
तीरे समानयनम्, तस्य तेन रत्नाद्युपहारैरर्हणम्, तस्य प्रशंसनम्, प्रह्लादसमुद्रयोः  
प्रश्नोत्तरकथासन्दर्भम्, नागपाशानां स्वयं भक्षणेन गरुडद्वारा विमोचनम्, तत्रैक-  
रात्रिं यावत्समुद्रतीरे एवावस्थाय प्रह्लादेन भगवत्स्तुतिम्, तस्य भगवत्स्वरूपसाक्षा-  
त्कारम्, प्रह्लादस्य विष्णुप्रसादेन विष्णुपुराणवद् भगवता वरप्रदानम्, पुनः पितृ-  
सविधे प्रह्लादस्योपसर्पणं च प्रस्तुत्य,

मूढ रे शृणु मद्वाक्यमेतदेवान्तिमं ध्रुवम् ।

इतो न त्वां प्रवक्ष्यामि श्रुत्वा कुरु यथेप्सितम् ॥

इत्युक्त्वाऽसिमुद्यम्य सर्वैः संभ्रमाद् वीक्षितस्य हिरण्यकशिपोः :—

क चास्ति मूढ ते विष्णुः स त्वामद्य प्ररक्षतु ।

त्वयोक्तं स हि सर्वत्र कस्मात्स्तम्भे न दृश्यते ॥

इत्याक्रोशपूर्वकमुद्यमम्, भगवतः स्तम्भादाविर्भावम्, ततो हिरण्यकशिपुनृसिंहयो-  
र्युद्धप्रकारं चोषवर्ण्यं तद्वधपर्यन्तं ४३, ४४ अध्यायाभ्यां संगृह्णाति ।

नात्र प्रह्लादस्य भगवतश्च संवादः, हिरण्यकशिपुवधात् पूर्वं वरदानादिकं वा  
विष्णुपुराण इव तद्वधानन्तरं वा भागवत इवोवलम्ब्यते ।

भागवतं तु—नृसिंहपुराणवदेव हिरण्यकशिपुवधान्तकथासन्दर्भं ग्रथ्णाति ।  
तदनन्तरं तु ब्रह्मरुद्रर्षिपितृसिद्धमनुप्रजापतिगन्धर्वचारणयक्षकिंपुरुषवैतालिकविष्णु-

पार्षदद्वारा स्तुतिम्, ब्रह्मप्रार्थनया नृसिंहमुपसर्प्यातिगभीरार्थबहुलां प्रह्लादकृतां स्तुतिं चानुक्रमते ।

तत्र हिरण्यकशिपोः शुश्रूषामपि प्रह्लादस्तद्वधात्पूर्वं चकारेति विष्णुपुराण-  
कथासन्दर्भो नृसिंह-भागवतप्रस्तुतकथासन्दर्भेण विरुद्धं प्रतीयते । तथाऽपि  
विष्णुपुराणे—गुरुपित्रोश्चकारैव शुश्रूषां सोपि धर्मवित् ( विष्णु १-२०-३ )  
इत्युपसंहारानन्तरम्,

“पितर्युपरतिं नीते नरसिंहस्वरूपिणा ।

विष्णुना सोऽपि दैत्यानां मैत्रेयाभूत्पतिस्ततः ॥”

इति नृसिंहेनैव हिरण्यकशिपोर्वधः श्राव्यते ।

तत्र पुराणान्तरकथासन्दर्भः कल्पान्तरदृष्ट्या, मन्वन्तरदृष्ट्या वा, उत सांप्रतिक-  
वाराहकल्पीयवैवस्वतमन्वन्तरदृष्ट्या वेति प्रस्तुतविरोधपरिहारार्थं विमर्शनीयम् ।

तत्र सावर्णिकमन्वन्तरे इन्द्रपदं बलिचक्रवर्तिन इति बहुषु पुराणेषु वर्णनात्  
वैवस्वतमन्वन्तरे एवायं कथासन्दर्भ इति दृष्ट्या विरोधपरिहार एव समुचितः ।  
वैवस्वतमन्वन्तरमेतत्कल्पीयं वा, कल्पान्तरीयं वेति त्वन्यदेतत् । प्रतिकल्पं  
ब्रह्मभेदः, प्रतिमन्वन्तरं व्याससप्तर्षिपितृदेवेन्द्रादिलोकपालभेदा इति कूर्मपुराणम्,  
वराहपुराणम्, सौरपुराणम्, अन्यच्च ।

सति चैवं कल्पारम्भे सर्वेश्वराद् ब्रह्मणा पूर्वकल्पीयवेदपुराणेतिहासादीनामधि-  
गमः, व्यासस्य पुराणेतिहासाद्यधिगमस्तु ब्रह्मसकाशात्, परं तु तत्तन्मन्वन्तरो-  
चितनामकथासन्दर्भादिपरिवर्तनेन तत्र मन्वन्तरभेदेन क्वचनख्यानांशे, नामभेदादौ  
च परिवर्तनं ब्रह्मणैव निरधारि यन्न केनापि, किं बहुना व्यासेनापि परिवर्तनं  
क्षमते, इति तत्तत्कथासन्दर्भस्य तत्तन्मन्वन्तरदृष्ट्यैवाविरोधेन युक्तमयथानयनम् ।  
मन्वन्तरभेदेनावताराणां भेदस्तु तत्र तत्र कूर्मपुराणादिषु न विरुध्यते इति विविच्यते,  
यथा परशुरामदत्तात्रेयावतारेषु । नृसिंहावतारस्तु न कुत्रापि परिवर्तते, तत्कथा-  
सन्दर्भो वा, सति चैवमुक्तकथासन्दर्भाविरोधः कथं सुसंवाद इति विमर्शनीयम् ।

इदमत्र प्रतिभाति—विष्णुपुराणोक्तरीत्या कश्चित्कालं प्रह्लादस्य पितृशुश्रूषणा-  
नन्तरमेव हिरण्यकशिपोर्नृसिंहेन संहारः । तावताऽपि पुराणान्तराणां नात्र विरोधः ।  
नृसिंहपुराणे—

“इतो न त्वां प्रवक्ष्यामि श्रुत्वा कुरु यथेप्सितम् ।” इति

यथेप्सितमवस्थातुं प्रह्लाद उक्तो हिरण्यकशिपुनेति संप्रतिपन्नम् । परन्त्वदमेवात्रालोचनीयम्, यत् किञ्चित्कालं हिरण्यकशिपुना साकं प्रेम्णा भक्त्या वा प्रह्लादेनावस्थितं वा न वेति । यद्यवस्थितम्, तर्हि सन्दर्भान्तरे नृसिंहहिरण्ययोर्युद्धोपक्रमे प्रह्लादेन वारितो हिरण्यकशिपुः क्रुद्धः, तमुपलक्ष्य “कथं स्तम्भे न दृश्यते” इति पप्रच्छेत्येवमादि ग्रन्थसन्दर्भः सुष्ठु लगति, इति पुराणान्तरेण विष्णुपुराणस्याविरोधो हिरण्यकशिपुसंहारविषये ।

अत्र सौरपुराणस्याष्टाविंशाध्याये २२ श्लोकमारभ्य ३७ पर्यन्ता अनुसंधानमर्हन्ति । तदाशयस्तु—हिरण्यकशिपुपीडिता ब्रह्मादयो भगवन्तं शरणं प्रपन्नाः । तत्र ब्रह्मा भगवन्तमिदमुवाच—हे माधव ! मद्वरेणातिगर्वितो हिरण्यकशिपुः सकलान् देवान्, निर्धूतकल्मषान् मुनींश्च सर्वान् बाधते, क्षिप्रं तस्य हन्ता तु न कोऽपि दृश्यते । त्वमेवास्य हन्तेति मत्वा वयं त्वां शरणं गताः । अतः शीघ्रं देवानां कार्यसिद्धये त्वं हन्तुमर्हसि—इति । नारायणस्तु श्रुत्वा तदीरितं वाक्यं नरस्य सिंहस्यार्धतनुं गृहीत्वा महाघोरमसुराणां भयंकरं च नादं मुञ्चन्नाविरासीत् । हिरण्यकशिपुस्त्वतिभीषणं नृसिंहमवलोक्य प्रह्लादादीन्महाऽसुरांस्तस्य वधाय नियुयुजे । यदा हिरण्यकशिपोः पुत्राश्चत्वारः प्रह्लादः, अनुह्लादः, संह्लादः, ह्लादश्च दानवा नृसिंहेन युयुधिरे तत्र नृसिंहं प्रति ब्राह्ममस्त्रं प्रह्लादः प्राहिणोत् । अनुह्लादः संह्लादः, ह्लादश्च क्रमेण वैष्णवकौमारानेयास्त्राणि, यानि सर्वाणि भगवन्तं नृसिंहं प्राप्यैव भग्नानि वज्राहता द्रुमा इव । नृहरिस्तु चतुरोऽपि प्रह्लादादीन् हिरण्यकशिपुपुत्रान् द्वाभ्यां हस्ताभ्यां गृहीत्वा पुनः पुनर्धरण्यां क्षिप्यन् पीडयामास । तदा व्यथितान् स्वपुत्रानालोक्य जाज्वल्यमानः कोपेन हिरण्यकशिपुर्नृसिंहमभ्यषत् । प्रह्लादस्तु दैत्यराट् तदा युद्धान्निवृत्तोऽमितौजसो नृसिंहस्य भगवद्भावमवगत्य, ध्यात्वा च तदैव नारायणं मत्वा युद्धात् स्वयं निवृत्तो वारयामास सङ्ग्रामादन्यानपि दानवान् । उवाच च—एष परमात्मा सनातनो योगी च नारायणो ध्यातव्योऽस्माकम्, न तु योद्धव्यो कैरपीति निश्चितम्—इति । हिरण्यकशिपुस्तु पुत्रोदितमिदमनादृत्य यावद्वर्षशतत्रयं नृसिंहेन युयुधे । तदाऽन्ते तु सर्वात्मा विष्णुः क्रोधसरक्तलोचनो हिरण्यकशिपुं नखैर्विदारयामास ।

अत्रान्ते विश्वात्मको विष्णुरिति वर्णनेन नृसिंहस्यावतीर्णस्यापि 'कस्मात् स्तम्भे न दृश्यते' इति हिरण्यकशिपोः प्रश्ने प्रह्लादवाक्यपरिपालनार्थं तदानीमेव स्तम्भमध्यात् तस्यैव पुनराविर्भावः, ततो नृसिंहेन हिरण्यकशिपोर्वधश्चेत्यवगम्यते । सति चैवं पितृशुश्रूषणरतस्य भक्तस्यापि प्रह्लादस्य शत्रुबुद्ध्या नृसिंहेन साकं युद्धम्, परमात्मभावविज्ञानानन्तरं ततो निवृत्तिः, तेन तद्गतेन नृसिंहयुद्धाद्वार्यमाणस्य हिरण्यकशिपोः—यदि-विश्वात्मको विष्णुः, तर्हि सांप्रतमेव कुतो न स्तम्भे दृश्यते ? इति प्रश्नः स्तम्भमध्यात् तदानीमाविर्भूय हिरण्यकशिपोर्नखैर्विवारणादिकं सर्वमुपपद्यते, इति नृसिंहभागवतपुराणयोर्हिरण्यकशिपुवधसन्दर्भभागो विष्णुपुराणगतपितृशुश्रूषणानन्तरं यदि योज्यते, तर्हि न कोपि विरोधो हिरण्यकशिपुवधकथासन्दर्भात् । कूर्मपुराणमपि सौरपुराणवदेव नृसिंहेन प्रह्लादादीनां युद्धम्, ततो विश्वात्मकेन नृसिंहेन हिरण्यस्य वधं च प्रस्तौति । वरप्रदानं तु प्रह्लादस्य यद्यपि विष्णुपुराणं हिरण्यकशिपुवधात्पूर्वं श्रावयति, भागवतं तु ततः पश्चादिति यद्यपि विरोधः प्रतिभातीव, तथाऽपि वधात् पूर्वं वरदानप्रभावेण सन्तुष्टेन पित्रा सह तच्छुश्रूषणपूर्वकं प्रह्लादस्यावस्थानेऽपि पुनरपि भगवता नृसिंहेन साकं युद्धकरणादिना सज्जातस्यापराधस्य क्षमाप्रार्थनं न विरुध्यते, इति भागवते हिरण्यकशिपुवधानन्तरं प्रह्लादवरप्रार्थनादिकं सर्वमविरुद्धम् । सर्वाण्यपि पुराणानि प्रायेण हिरण्यकशिपुवधान्तकथासन्दर्भमेव श्रावयन्ति ।

हरिभक्तिसुधोदयोऽपि नृसिंहविष्णुपुराणाद्यैकवाक्यतया यथासंभवमविरोधेन हिरण्यकशिपुवधान्तकथासन्दर्भं सविस्तरं नवभिरध्यायैः सरलया शैल्या महाकाव्य-वत्सुमधुरमुपन्यस्यति । अयं नारदीयपुराणान्तर्गत इति तत्र दृश्यते । श्रीघर-स्वामिनाम्, येषां पुराणव्याख्यानं कुलधनम्, तैरस्य व्याख्याकरणान्नास्य पुराणत्वे विप्रतिपत्तेः संभावना । सर्वथा तु बृहन्नारदीयपुराणे नार्यं प्रह्लादचरितांश उपलभ्यते महापुराणे । उपपुराणमपि किञ्चिन्नारदीयं पुराणं स्कान्दपुराणवत् संभाव्यते । परितृप्त्यमानमुद्रितपुराणेष्वनुपलभ्यमानाः पुराणपदवेदनीयाः केचन निबन्धास्तत्र तत्र दृश्यमानास्तत्प्राप्त्याप्राप्ताभ्यामप्ययोः सन्दिह्यन्ते । सर्वथा तु पुराणान्तराविरुद्धा-न्तमेव कथासन्दर्भाणां प्रह्लादचरितविषये हरिभक्तिसुधोदयेन सुमधुरं वर्णनात्तत्प्राप्त्याप्यं न व्याह्रियते । हरिभक्तिसुधोदयः स्वतन्त्रं पुराणान्तरमुपपुराणं वा भवतु । पुराणार्थ-

संकलनात् पुराणवद्वा प्रमाणं भवतु । प्रह्लादचरितसमालोचने तु स सर्वथाऽनु-  
न्धानमर्हति । अयं हि निबन्धो देवनागरलिप्यां सद्राविडभाषाविवरणं मद्रास-  
राज्यस्थितकामकोटिकोशस्थानेन मुद्राप्य प्रकाशितः ।

हिरण्यकशिपुवधानन्तरं प्राप्तराज्यस्य प्रह्लादस्य किञ्चित्कालानन्तरं विष्णुना  
साकं युद्धम्, तत्र पराजयश्चासीदिति तत्र कारणनिर्देशपूर्वकं सौरपुराणं वर्णयति ।<sup>१</sup>

इदं तु युद्धं विष्णुप्रह्लादयोर्वामनपुराणोक्तं नरनारायणयुद्धं वा, अथवा  
स्वतन्त्रमन्यद्वेति विचारणीयम् । तत्र वामनपुराणादौ नरनारायणयुद्धपराजयानन्तरं  
स्वीयं राज्यशासनाधिकारं परित्यज्य स्वस्थाने प्रह्लादेनान्धकोऽभिषिक्त इति  
वर्णनात्, सौरपुराणेऽपि 'त्यक्त्वा मायामयं सर्वं शार्ङ्गिणं शरणं ययौ' इत्यनन्तरम्,  
'अभिषिच्यान्धकं राज्ये योगयुक्तोऽभवत्स्वयम्' इत्यनुक्रमाद् वामनपुराणान्तर्गतं  
नरनारामणयुद्धमेवैवत् प्रह्लादस्येति प्रत्यभिज्ञायते ।

श्रीमद्भागवतं हि क्वचित् संग्रहेण, क्वचिद् विस्तरेण च विष्णुपुराणार्थं  
विवृणोति । श्रीमद्भागवते द्वादशभिः स्कन्धैरुपवर्णितानां तत्त्वानां व्याख्याता-  
नामन्येषां च विष्णुपुराणमेव मूलम् । विष्णुपुराणं पराशरेण मैत्रेयस्योपदे-  
शात्मकम् । भागवतं त्वंशतो मैत्रेयेण विदुरस्योपदेशात्मकम्, इत्येकमेव  
पर्याप्तं तयोर्मूलमूलिभावे । तथाऽपि विष्णुपुराणेऽनुक्ता अपि केचनांशाः प्रह्लाद-  
चरिते भागवतेन संगृह्यन्ते । भागवतेऽनुक्ता अपि केचनांशा विष्णुपुराणे च ।  
किं बहुना भागवतविष्णुपुराणयोर्दुष्परिहरा विरोधा अपि तत्र तत्र दृश्यन्ते ।

तत्र श्रीभागवतम्—

“श्रुतमेतन्मया पूर्वं ज्ञानं विज्ञानसंयुतम् ।

धर्मं भागवते शुद्धं नारदादेवदर्शनात् ॥”

इति प्रह्लादवचनं श्रुत्वा—

“प्रह्लाद त्वं वयं चापि नर्तेऽन्यं विद्महे गुरुम् ।

बालस्यान्तःपुरस्थस्य महत्सङ्गो दुरन्वयः ॥

छिन्धि नः संशयं सौम्य स्याच्चेद् विश्रम्भकारणम् ।” इति

दैतेयानां प्रश्नोत्तरप्रसङ्गेन सप्तमस्कन्धे प्रह्लादस्य नारदसत्सङ्गप्रकारं विशदयति ।

इदं च सर्वं नृसिंहपुराणेऽपि दैतेयानां प्रह्लाददैतेयसंवादावसरे त्रिचत्वारिं-  
शाध्याये प्रथमादित्रयोविंशान्तश्लोकेषु प्रत्यक्षम् ।

तत्र विष्णुपुराणं न केवलं यथाभागवतनृसिंहपुराणं दैतेयानां प्रह्लादे-  
नोपदेशम्, किन्तु सरल्या शैल्या भगवतस्तत्त्वोपदेशमपि प्रह्लादहिरण्यकशिपु-  
संवादमुखेन, हिरण्यकशिपुकृता प्रह्लादस्य वधोपायाः, प्रह्लादकृतानि विष्णु-  
स्तोत्राणि च संगृह्णाति ।<sup>१</sup>

अत्र सर्वत्र गुरुप्रह्लादयोः, प्रह्लादपरमात्मनोः, हिरण्यकशिपुप्रह्लादयो-  
श्चोक्तिप्रत्युक्तयः, प्रतिशिक्षणं, ततो रक्षितस्य प्रह्लादस्य भगवत्स्तुतिप्रकाराश्च  
प्रातःस्मरणीया जप्यमन्त्राः । तत्रान्ते समुद्रपातपर्यन्तं शिक्षणं संग्रहेण भागवते,  
ततोऽपि विस्तरेण नृसिंहपुराणे च दृश्यते । अयमत्र नृसिंहपुराणविष्णुपुराण-  
योर्भागवताद् विशेषः, यत्-विष्णुपुराणे विंशाध्याये प्रह्लादस्य शिक्षणादन्तिमाद्  
भगवता रक्षितस्य हिरण्यकशिपुवधात् पूर्वं भगवता वरप्रदानम् ततः प्रह्लादोपरि  
प्रेमातिशयेन तेन साकं हिरण्यकशिपोः स्वगृहे निवासः । प्रह्लादेन गुरुबुद्ध्या  
हिरण्यकशिपोः शुश्रूषाकरणं च प्रस्तूयते यत्तु भागवतपुराणे नोपलभ्यते ।

अत्र नृसिंहपुराणे प्रथमतपस्यायां हिरण्यकशिपोस्तपःपूर्तिः, तपसा संतुष्टाद्  
ब्रह्मणोऽन्यस्माद् वा वरप्राप्तिर्वा न वर्णिता ।<sup>२</sup> श्रीमद्भागवते तु सप्तमस्कन्धतृतीया-  
ध्याये तत्तपश्चर्यादिकं च विस्तरेण प्रस्तुतम् ।

१—विष्णुपुराणम् ( गीताप्रेससंस्करणम् ), अंश १, अध्या० १७-२० ।

२—नृसिंहपुराणे ( गोपालनारायण कम्पनी, मुम्बई, संस्करणम्, १९११ ई० )  
चत्वारिंशत्तमेऽध्याये हिरण्यकशिपोर्महतस्तपसो वर्णनमुपलभ्यते (अ० ४०, श्लो० १-२),  
तथा तेन तपसा संतुष्टाद् ब्रह्मणः सकाशाद् हिरण्यकशिपुना वरयाचनम् ( ४०।९-१० ),  
ब्रह्मणा तस्मै वरप्रदानं (श्लो० १०-१३) च वर्णितं; परन्तु तत्तपो वरप्रदानादिकं च हिरण्य-  
कशिपोर्द्वितीयस्यास्तपस्यायाःकाले संभाव्येत, न तु प्रथमतपःकाले, तस्य कलविष्णुपक्षिरूपिणा  
नारदेन विदितत्वात् (अ० ४१, श्लो० १३-१९) ।



अतो ज्ञायते पुराणद्वयैकवाक्यतया द्विवारं तपश्चर्या हिरण्यकशिपुना कृता, यत्र द्वितीयस्यामेव तपश्चर्यायां वरप्रदानादिकं सर्वत्र । तत्र द्वितीया तपश्चर्या तु प्रह्लादस्य गर्भावस्थायाम्, यदेन्द्रात्सुरक्षितायाः कयाधोः प्रह्लादमातुर्नारदेन तत्त्वोपदेशः, यमेव प्रह्लादो दैत्यसन्नह्यचारिणां सविधे न्यवेदयदिति श्रीमद्भागवतं वर्णयति । तत्र द्वितीयतपश्चर्यायां सन्तुष्टस्य तत्पुरतः प्रत्यक्षस्य च ब्रह्मणः सविधे यथेच्छं वरप्रार्थनाय ब्रह्मणा प्रेरितेन हिरण्यकशिपुना प्रार्थिता वराः, ते यथा—

भूतेभ्यस्त्वद्विसृष्टेभ्यो मृत्युर्माभून्मम प्रभो ।

नान्तर्बहिर्दिवानक्तमन्यस्मादपि चायुधैः ॥ इत्यादयः ॥

(भाग० पु०, ७।३।३५-३८)

विष्णुपुराणमपि—“ब्रह्मणो वरदर्पितः” इति श्रीभागवतार्थमत्र प्रकारान्तरेणार्थतो विस्तृणाति । भागवते च लब्धवरस्य हिरण्यकशिपोर्महेन्द्रादिपदायत्तीकरणम्, देवानां भगवतः शरणागतिः, भगवता देवानामाश्वासनं, हिरण्यकशिपु-शासनकाले भगवन्नामसंकीर्तनप्रतिषेधः, तमुल्लङ्घ्य सुधीरं केवलं प्रह्लादस्य भगवन्नामसंकीर्तनम्, तत्प्रभावार्जनादिना भागवतधर्मप्रचारः, तेन कुपितस्य हिरण्यकशिपोस्तद्वधोपायश्च प्रस्तूयते । (भाग० पु०, स्कन्ध ७, अ० ४ इत्यादि) । हिरण्यकशिपुवधार्थं भगवता देवानामाश्वासनं न विष्णुपुराणे दृश्यते ।

नृसिंहपुराणस्य द्विचत्वारिंशत्तमोऽध्यायः प्रह्लादस्य कौमारे गुरुकुलवासावसरे च तदीयभागवतभावदर्शनजनितकोपातिशयेन हिरण्यकशिपोराज्ञया गुरूणां तदुभर्त्सनादिकं वर्णयति ।

अनन्तरं तु दन्दशूकादिना प्रह्लादहिंसनं हिरण्यकशिपोराज्ञया कृतमप्यकृत-प्रायमभवत्तदीयेन भक्त्यतिशयेन सन्तुष्टस्य भगवतोऽनुग्रहेण । ततो भुजङ्ग-विषादिभिरन्यैश्च हिरण्यकशिपुना कारितं प्रह्लादहिंसनमपि भगवदेकान्तचित्तस्य प्रह्लादस्य न फलायाकल्पत । हिरण्यकशिपुस्तु सर्वमिदं प्रह्लादप्रभावमालक्ष्य महतीं चिन्तामवाप । श्रीमद्भागवतं प्रायेणत्र समानम् । तच्छिक्षणप्रकारः सर्वोपि सप्तमस्कन्धे पञ्चमाध्याये संगृहीतः ।

तत्र नृसिंहपुराणे शिक्षितस्य प्रह्लादस्य पुनरपि सदुपदेशेन स्वायत्तीकरणार्थं हिरण्यकशिपोरुद्यमः श्रीमद्भागवत इव नोपनिबद्धः । अत्र प्रधानो भागवत-सप्तमस्कन्धषष्ठाध्यायविषयस्तु प्रह्लादेन दैत्यसब्रह्मचारिणः प्रत्युपदिष्टमपूर्वमेव रत्नम् । विष्णुपुराणं तु श्रीमद्भागवतवत् प्रथमं गुरुकुलवासकाले पठितांश-वर्णनार्थं हिरण्यकशिपुना प्रह्लादस्य नियोगम्, तद्वाक्यं श्रुत्वा तद्वधार्थमाज्ञापनम्, तेन शिक्षितस्यापि भगवता रक्षितस्य प्रह्लादस्य भगवति भक्त्यतिशयसमृद्धिम्, पुनरपि गुरुकुलं प्रति प्रेषणम्, तत्र तदा प्रह्लादेन दैत्यसब्रह्मचारिणस्तत्त्वोपदेशं च प्रथमांशसप्तदशाध्यायशेषेण सह संगृह्णाति ।

—: ० :—

### पुराण-रत्नानि

तापत्रयेणाभिहतं यदेतदखिलं जगत् ।  
तदा शोच्येषु भूतेषु द्वेषः प्राज्ञः करोति कः ॥  
अथ भद्राणि भूतानि हीनशक्तिरहं परम् ।  
मुदं तदापि कुर्वीत हानिद्वेषफलं यतः ॥

(विष्णुपु ०, १।१७।८०-८१)

# HOME OF THE MATSYAPURĀṆA\*

By

S. G. KANTAWALA

[ अत्र लेखे मत्स्यपुराणस्य रचनास्थलं विचार्यते । मत्स्यपुराणं दक्षिणभारते रचितमिति दीक्षितारमहोदयस्य मतम्, आन्ध्रप्रदेशे रचितमिति पार्जितारमहोदयस्य कथनम्, नासिकप्रदेशे रचितमिति च हाजरामहोदयेन प्रतिपादितम् । विदुषा लेखकेनात्र सर्वेषामेतेषां मतानां सम्यगालोचना कृता । हाजरामहोदयस्यैव मतं लेखकस्यापि सम्मतमस्ति, यतो मत्स्यपुराणे नर्मदाया नर्मदाक्षेत्रस्य च माहात्म्यं बाहुल्येनोपलभ्यते; गङ्गामाहात्म्यादपि नर्मदाया माहात्म्यमधिकमिति च प्रतिपाद्यते । नर्मदाप्रदेशस्य सम्यक् परिचयोऽध्यत्रोपलभ्यते । बौकारेश्वरसमीपवर्तिनो नर्मदाकावेरीसंगमस्थोल्लेखः, नर्मदायाश्चोत्तरतटैर् वर्तमानस्य भारभूतिसमीपवर्तिनो दशाश्वमेधतीर्थस्य वर्णनं, तथाऽन्येषामपि च केषांचिद् नर्मदातटवर्तिस्थानानां कथनं मत्स्यपुराणरचयितुर्नर्मदाप्रदेशपरिचयं सूचयति, येन मत्स्यपुराणस्य रचनायाः स्थानं नर्मदाप्रदेशमेवेति सिध्यति । ]

Regarding the place of the composition of the MP there is no unanimity of opinion. South India, Nasik and the Narmadā Valley are claimed as the home of the MP by different scholars. The late Professor V. R. R. Dikshitar expressed the opinion that it "might have originated in South India"<sup>1</sup>, on the assumption that the MP originally started with the Matsya tribe who inhabited the Matsya country. To this it is to be submitted with due deference to the late Professor's view that the MP sings nothing of the Matsya tribe. Moreover, the Matsya country corresponds to the modern territory of Jaipura<sup>2</sup>. "It included the whole of the present territory of Alwar with a portion of Bharatpura; the capital of the Matsya country was Virāṭanagar (modern Bairat) named after its founder-king Virāṭa..... A branch of the Matsyas is similarly

\* A part of the Ph. D. thesis accepted by the M. S. University of Baroda.

1. Dikshitar V.R.R., *The Matsya Purāṇa, A Study*, p. 24.

2. Dikshitar V.R.R., *op. cit.*, pp. 20 ff

found in later days in the Vizagapatam region"<sup>1</sup>. From this it is clear that in the subcontinent of India there were two territories—one in North India and the second in South India—which went by the name of the Matsya country. It is to be noted that the late Professor is aware of these two locations of this country.<sup>2</sup> In the face of these facts that the Matsya country claims two locations for its identification, it is of dubious value to give weightage to its identification in South India on such grounds that the Fish appeared to Manu performing austerities on the Malaya hills (1.12) and the places like Rāmeśvara are mentioned in the MP. It is to be remembered that the places like Rāmeśvara are of pan-Indian fame and it is but natural that those places find a mention in the MP. According to the ŚB 1.8.1.5 and the Mbh. (Cr. Ed) 3.185.44 the place of deluge is the Himalayas and the mention of the Malaya hills would, at the most, suggest that the attempt is made to shift the North Indian place of penance to South India, but even according to the MP 1.24 the place of scene shifts to the Ganges, a renowned river of North India. Thus South India is not a convincing contender for the home of the MP<sup>3</sup>

The Andhra country appears to be suggested as the home of the MP by Pargiter, when he writes (of course in a different context) that "there is an apparent indication that a compilation was begun in the latter part of the 2nd century in the Andhra king Yajñaśrī's reign, for 5 Mss of the Matsya (of which three appear to be independent, namely *b*, *c* and *d*) speak of him as reigning in his ninth or tenth year."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Majumdar R. C. and Pusalkar A. D. (Ed.), *The Age of Imperial Unity*, pp 11-12.

2. Dikshitar V.R.R., *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

3. For detailed arguments of Dikshitar V.R.R., vide *ibid.*, pp 19 ff. The detailed refutation of his arguments is not undertaken here as the view is unconvincing for obvious reasons.

4. Pargiter F. E. *Purāṇic Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, Introduction, p. xiii fn. 1.

Dr. Haraprasad Shastri suggests that the place of the composition of the MP was Nasik on the strength of the great prominence given to the region about the river Godāvarī in the MP 114-37-39<sup>1</sup>, but as pointed out by Dr. R. C. Hazra, "this suggestion seems to have a very weak basis, for these verses of the Matsya tally with Vā (= Vāyu Purāṇa) 45, 112-114 and it has been shown that the Matsya borrowed some chapters from the Vāyu. The close agreement of the majority of the geographical chapters in the two Purāṇas seems to confirm the indebtedness of the Matsya to Vāyu".<sup>2</sup>

Dr. R. C. Hazra holds that the MP "was composed and circulated by Vaiṣṇavaite people living somewhere about the river Narmadā"<sup>3</sup> by arguing that when the indebtedness of the MP to the VP (= Vāyu Purāṇa) seems to be confirmed by the close agreement of the majority of the geographical chapters, one has "to look to those of its original chapters which have not been borrowed from any other work. Such an one is Chap. 2, In it the river Narmadā and not the famous Ganges, is said to remain even after the destruction of the world (cf. Mat. 2, 13-14). Elsewhere, in chap. 15 (which most probably belongs to a little later date and which has a few verses common with Vā 73), this river "which flows through the Deccan" is called the 'mind-born daughter' of the Somapa Pitṛs living in the Mānasaloka (cf. 15, 25-28)".<sup>4</sup> Thus according to him these passages tend to suggest that the composition of the MP took place somewhere about the river Narmadā.

A. M. T. Jackson also opines that the MP may represent the original version of the work of the Brahmins on the Narmadā.<sup>5</sup> On the ground of the long list of place-names etc.

---

1. Shastri Harprasad, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS in the collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V (Purāṇa MSS), Preface, p. cxc.

2. Hazra R. C., *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, p. 52.

3. Hazra R. C., *op. cit.* p. 52.

4. Hazra R. C., *op. cit.*, p. 52.

5. Jackson A. M. T., *Epic and Purāṇic Notes, the Centenary Volume of the JBRS* (1905), p. 73.

on the Narmadā, Ram Pratap Tripathi also opines that the original bard-reciter had special connections with the Narmadā-valley region.<sup>1</sup>

Over and above the stray references eulogising the glory of the Narmadā there are nine chapters i. e. chapters 186-194 extolling the greatness of the Narmadā. These chapters betray good acquaintance of the place-names on or near the Narmadā-valley as well as that of the names of the distributaries and tributaries, e. g. the confluence of a rivulet Kāverī with the Narmadā near Oṃkāreśvara in the Madhya Pradesh is also mentioned in the MP (189.2 ff). This mention of their confluence is only possible if the compiler had good acquaintance of the Narmadā region; otherwise it would be silly on his part to speak of the confluence of the Kāverī of South India with the Narmadā. Among the minor place-names, mention may be made of Daśāśvamedha (193.21 ff), a sacred bathing place at Broach, Bhārabhūti (194.18), modern Bhāḍabhūta on the northern bank of the Narmadā, 8 miles away from Broach, Koṭitīrtha (191.7), which possibly refers to Koṭitīrtha in Motī Koral.<sup>2</sup>

This tends to substantiate Dr. Hazra's view *vis.* the Narmadā-region as the home of the MP. Moreover the further studies of the place-names and the geographical data of the chapters on the *Narmadā-māhātmya* seem further to corroborate the above opinion.<sup>3</sup> Secondly Dr. V. Raghavan also suggests the Narmadā-region as the place of the composition of the present Purāṇa, when he writes, "In II. 13, Narmadā is mentioned as the only river that will last through the deluge which may give a clue to the place where the present text was composed".<sup>4</sup>

1. Tripathi, Ram Pratap, *Matsya Mahā-purāṇa (Hindī Translation)*, Introduction, p. 5.

2. *Tīrthāṅka (Kalyāṇa)* p- 433.

3. See my paper on "the place-Names on the Narmadā with special reference to the Narmadā-māhātmya of the Matsyapurāṇa" read on 20-8-1960 before the Gujarāṭa-Śthala-nāma-Samśad of the M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda.

4. Raghavan V., Gleanings from the Matsya-purāṇa, *Purāṇa*, Vol. I, No. I, July 1959, pp. 85-86.

In the light of the above evidence, the Narmadā-region may be provisionally accepted as the place of composition of the Matsya-Purāṇa.

**Abbreviations used in this Paper :—**

MP = Matsya-Purāṇa, Anandāśrama Press edition.

SB = Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa

Mbh = Mahābhārata.

Cr. Ed = Critical Edition.

The unspecified references such as 191.7 always refer to the Matsya-Purāṇa, thus 191.7 = MP 191.7.

—: 0 :—

## पुराण-रत्नानि

यदा न कुरुते भावं सर्वभूतेषु पापकम् ।

समदृष्टेस्तदा पुंसः सर्वाः सुखमया दिशः ॥

या दुस्त्यजा दुर्मतिभिर्या न जीर्यति जीर्यतः ।

तां तृष्णां संत्यजेत्प्राज्ञः सुखेनैवाभिपूर्यते ॥

(विष्णुपु०, ४।१०।२५-२६)

# A METRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MATSYA PURĀṆA\*

By

C. R. SWAMINATHAN

(Continued from Vol. II. P. 251 of this Bulletin)

[मत्स्यपुराणे प्रयुक्तानां छन्दसामालोचनात्मकनिबन्धस्यायं द्वितीयो भागः प्रकाशयते, अस्य प्रथमो भागस्तु पूर्वं प्रकाशितः । तत्र प्रथमे भागे आनन्दाश्रमसुव्रितमत्स्यपुराणस्य १३३ अध्यायस्य ६८ श्लोकपर्यन्तं छन्दसां विचारः कृतः, अस्मिन् द्वितीये भागे १३३ अध्यायस्य ६९ श्लोकत आरभ्य १३९ अध्यायस्य ४५ श्लोकपर्यन्तं विचारः प्रस्तुतः । कुत्रचित् स्थलेषु च छन्दोभ्रूरोधेनार्थभ्रूरोधेन च पाठसंशोधनमपि कृतम्, तदपि च प्रायः कोशसाक्ष्यनुसारेण, यथा १३८ अध्यायस्य २९, ५२ श्लोकयोः क्रमेण चतुर्थे तृतीये च पादे ।]

Ch. 133-69.

Chapter 133 ends with two verses describing the Pramathaganas surrounding the chariot of Śiva and the chariot itself proceeding for the encounter with Tripuras. The ASS. edition notes that one of its manuscripts does not have these four lines. Of our manuscripts, five of the North do not have all the four lines. The difficulty about v. 69 is that while its first half as well as the two halves of 70 that follow are all in correct Aparavaktra, the second half of 69 alone is cast in the measure of the second pāda of Pushpitāgrā. The variants available for the second half are of no moment, as they do not entail any change in the character of the syllables. That is, according to all the manuscripts, this line would be in Pushpitāgrā (second pāda) and we have to accept a metrical mixture for 69.

Regarding 69 a-b in Aparavaktra, all the manuscripts except four show the same metre, despite the variations in the words. In four manuscripts, 69a above is read with eleven

---

\* Prepared under the direction of Dr. V. Raghavan.



syllables करिवराजनमेघसज्जिभाः : and 69b is read in three manuscripts out of these four, as having eleven syllables. सजलपयोदधिनिस्वनाः. But a metrical pattern of the Ardhasama class or of the Vishama class having 11-11 or 11-12, answering to the one in discussion is not known. It would therefore be necessary to accept on the manuscript evidence a mixture of Aparavaktra and Pushpitāgrā here.

A few verses above, in V. 66, the Pramathas who were following Śiva are described as being of the colour of fire and flames. असथाश्चाग्निवर्णाभाः साग्निज्वाला इवोल्मुकाः ।

On the basis of this we should take 69a-b as comparing the Pramathas to elephants, mountains or clouds only in points of size and noise, and not in colour. We may therefore discount the reading in four manuscripts bringing in अजन among the comparisons. To support further, this rejection of 'Añjana' we have in eight manuscripts, as also in the ĀSS. the inclusion of Ravi among the objects compared which accords with the earlier description in verse 66.

Ch. 134 ends with three Pushpitāgrā verses all of which are correct except for the closing pāda of the middle verse, which reads in the ĀSS—मदनार्यन्धकयज्ञदेहघातम्. The ĀSS itself notes two manuscripts as reading it in correct Pushpitāgrā as यममदनान्धकयज्ञदेहघातम्. A reading of this type, whatever its literary variation, should be restored here. In our manuscripts none has got the reading as in ĀSS, though in two manuscripts, owing to corruption, the metre is affected by mistakes of the scribe.

In verse 69, there is a mixture of Upajāti (First half) and Vamśastha (second half). Though the preceding and the succeeding lines are in the Vamśastha, manuscripts do not give any readings to alter the Upajāti of the first half into Vamśastha.

135-71c:

71a, b, d are in correct Vamśastha while 'c' alone has an Indravajrā-beginning according to the ĀSS. All manuscripts

read 'c' also as a correct Vamśastha though the Anvaya of the line as Vamśastha is not clear; the Vamśastha-readings introduce two रिप्स and two बल्स in c, d and the construction becomes difficult. Except in one manuscript, the opening word of the Vamśastha-reading is बल्. Of these, four read the word in instrumental plural and the rest in accusative singular. These four readings with बलैः read also अभिरक्षितं as अक्षितं—

बलै रिप्सां प्रवरैरक्षितम् ।

It is probably to avoid this difficulty of construing two बल्स., that the ĀSS text reads एते in the place of बलं or बलैः.

135-73c, d :

73c, d, introduce a metrical mixture, 'c' having an Indravajrā-opening and 'd' being a regular Upendravajrā-line. In our manuscripts which have this line there are, no doubt, some variants but none that effects any improvement from the metrical view-point. Some of our other manuscripts omit this line and read 'c' as—

तदुल्लवणं ध्वान्तमुदप्ररोचिषा and 'd' as प्रद्योततास्त्रेण तदैव देवराद् (or विपातयामास शरेण सादरम् )

There is much confusion in this portion and even the Āss notes variations and additions from 'd' onwards.

135-78d.

यथैव इन्द्राशनयः पतन्त्यः shows a hiatus. In all the manuscripts compared, the hiatus has been removed but in a variety of ways, some introducing a 'च' after यथैव .

135-82.

In 82 a, b and d are in Upendravajrā and 'c' alone in Vamśastha. In 'a' the metre is broken by the word श्रुत्वा and only one of our manuscripts, the Grantha manuscript from Trivandrum, avoids this by regarding the line as श्रुत्वा मयस्येति स तारकाक्षः

Regarding 'c' which alone is Vamśastha in ĀSS., most of our manuscripts read only Indravajrā, with a corresponding omission of the word अदित्याः विवेश तूष्णीं त्रिपुरं सहैव दितेऽसुतैर्युद्धविबुध ( धृतप्र, कृतप्र, विवृत्त, प्रवृत्त ) हर्षैः

136-63 :

The verse in ASS. reads 'b' and 'd' in correct Aparavaktra, 'c' in correct Pushpitāgrā, but 'a' alone does not answer precisely to any metre. Fourteen of our manuscripts which have this verse, read the whole verse as Pushpitāgrā with slight differences in the words from the literary stand-point :

रथचरणकरोऽप्यवाप्य ( प ) युद्धे, वृषभवपुर्वृषभेन्द्रपुत्रपूज्यः ।

दितितनयबलं विमर्द्य सर्वं, त्रिपुरपुरं प्रविवेश केशवोऽपि ॥

It may be added in support that the next verse is also in Pushpitāgrā.

A further point to be noted in this connection is that only 8 Mss. have these two verses 63 and 64 as in ĀSS. and 11 read here instead the following Anushtubh conveying the same idea, though with some variants in the words, among themselves. In two mss. both the ĀSS reading and the Anushtubh readings are found. In one ms. neither reading is found.

ततो वृषवपुर्विष्णुः तत्पुरं प्रविवेश ह ।

तत्रामृतरसां वार्षीं कृत्वा ज्वलनमण्डिताम् ॥

शतपत्रवनाढ्यां च कर्पूरक्षोदगन्धिनीम् ।

पपौ संमोह्य दैत्येन्द्रान् वृषरूपधरो हरिः ॥

137-29 :

Here 'a' are in Aparavaktra. We may leave the whole verse as it is in ĀSS as an example of the usual mixture of metres, for the evidence of the manuscripts is very varied and confused ; several attempting a wrong Mālini-ardha and others different defective lines akin to Viyoginī, Aparavaktra, Pushpitāgrā etc. In two manuscripts, an additional marginal

variant noted reads a correct Mālinī-ardha. Any solution to be offered on the basis of these would fail to restore Viyoginī-pādas for 'c' and 'd'. In the Grantha manuscript and three Devanāgarī Mss. from Tanjore (T1, T8 and T6), 'd' alone is read as Viyoginī, though among themselves they have difference of readings प्रतिशब्दांश्च विनेदुर्लब्धः, the 'c' being defective. As a metrical mixture for this verse is inevitable, we may leave that mixed pattern as it is in ĀSS. Most of the words of 'c' as in Āss occur in all the variants of our manuscripts. Of the words in 'd' विविध, वल and नद in different forms are found in most manuscripts though in different order and वन also in a few.

137-30 :

Reference was made above to some of our manuscripts, trying to read 29 c, d in Mālinī. In nine of our Manuscripts a stray Mālinī foot is found as a substitute for 30a only.

असुरवरपुराणां दारणे ( पातने, मारणे ) बद्धकक्षाः

instead of अष्टुरवरपुरेऽपि दारणे [ जलघरराक्वृदङ्गगह्वरः ] of the ĀSS. In other manuscripts, this pāda, as well as the three others, shows many variants but there is no ground to construct the pādas in a metre different from Aparavaktra in which they are found in ĀSS.

137-31 :

Similarly for 31a also a Mālinī reading is found in four manuscripts (U-2, U-1, T-7, T-0) :

अथ भुवनपतीशः सर्वथाऽक्षौ ( सर्वदासौ, सर्वदेशः ) सुराणाम् instead of: अथ भुवनपतिर्गतिः सुराणाम् ।

137-32 :

This verse opens with an address to Śiva as the leader of the divine hordes. Consequently the text of the previous verse as read in the ASS particularly in 31c, is to be read with an inter-change of the nominative and the accusative, i. e., as निरुद्धराजपतिं श्रुवाच शक्रः 32 and 33a, b would be Indra's address to Śiva. The verse is in Pushpitāgrā as printed in ASS and there

is no difficulty of the metre except in 'b' where निकेतनं offends the metre by having its final syllable long. The difficulty is solved in nine of our manuscripts by simply omitting the Anusvāra and reading only निकेतन in an uninflected form. Five manuscripts face the difficulty of an uninflected निकेतन by variants for the two following words as निकेतनमर्णवोपरिष्ठात् । On the whole there are sixteen manuscripts which read उपरिष्ठात् to remove the difficulty of प्रविष्टाः without the accusative निकेतनम्. It is interesting to note that in many of these manuscripts reading: त्रिपुरनिकेतनदानवोपरिष्ठात् or त्रिपुरनिकेतनमर्णवोपरिष्ठात्, the first Pāda is amplified in two Pādas :

त्रिदशगणपते निबोध सम्यगेतत् त्रिपुरपुरं सहस्रैव भीतमेतत् ( or सहसा सहैव भीतां (तं) )  
These two pādas would be metrically correct and might be retained, if we could reject the other pāda त्रिपुरनिकेतनदानवाः प्रविष्टाः. A five-pāda verse could not be kept.

32 c, d, do not offer any metrical problems though there are some literary variants.

137-34 :

Verse 34 presents manifold difficulties. 'b' and 'd' of this verse are in twelve syllables in a pattern which answers to a Viyoginī plus one guru letter, which would be Subodhitā or Priyā according to Jayakīrti's Chhandonusāsana (v. 316). 'a' and 'c' are not in any recognisable pattern and between themselves too they have no agreement. 'c' could be restored to a Pushpitāgrā with a slight change in the fourth syllable from a guru to a laghu. Five manuscripts have readings, though mutually divergent, supporting a Pushpitāgrā. From the sense it would be proper to take this line along with the next verse as forming Śiva's speech to the Devas and Indra ; and adopting the reading of one of our manuscripts, we could read this foot as—अभिभवत पुरं सदानवेन्द्रम् ।

'a' of course is the most difficult part of this verse. But from the sense it is clear that along with 'b', it refers to the Devas taking their stand at the sea. It could not be a reference to the demons taking their stand there. Most of our manuscripts

read the foot as having a correct Pushpitāgrā—ending with तनूजाः and two manuscripts read अदितेः; three manuscripts which read परिगणयन्तोदितेः may also be supposed to read अदितेः. The word परिगणयन्तः is really perplexing as there is nothing to cogitate here. It may be that the element गण refers more to their forming together into a battalion, a sense in which 'Gaṇa' occurs in the earlier verses. A text meaning "collecting together round Śiva, the Devas took their stand at the head of the sea" would appear to be alright in the context and though unsupported by manuscripts we may read the middle part of this pāda as इति परिगणयः । Thus the whole verse would be—

इति परिगणयोऽदितेस्तनूजाः  
अवतस्थुर्लवणार्णवोपरिष्ठात् ।  
अभिभवत् पुरं सदानवेन्द्रं  
शरद्वर्षैर्मुसलैश्च वज्रमुख्यैः ॥

137-35 :

This verse is in Aparavaktra in 'a' 'b' and 'd'. 'c' alone in ĀSS is printed as a Pushpitāgrā. Three of our manuscripts including the 'Śārada', have an Aparavaktra for 'c' also—असुर-वर (पुर) वधार्थमुद्यतः But there has been in the manuscripts a more wide-spread effort to convert the Aparavaktra feet to Pushpitāgrā. Strangely even the 'Śārada' which retains a correct Aparavaktra, for 'c' is found adding a final syllable and effecting Pushpitāgrā in 'a' and 'b'. There is, however, no uniformity in this attempt and the final syllable added discloses a palpably lame effort. We may therefore retain for the whole verse the Aparavaktra-readings.

137-36 ;

This verse is also to be taken as Aparavaktra, 'a' is correct as printed in ĀSS; 'b' has one letter in excess and also other defects in the syllables. A larger number of Manuscripts read it correctly in Aparavaktra as दशशतनेप्रवयुः समुद्यतः । 'c' and 'd' are both correct as printed.

138-21:

21d—तथैव कन्दन्ति विभिन्नदेहाः is in faulty Upajāti. In the verse, the battle in the sea is described and for every act of the fighters, an act of the sea animals also is mentioned in apposition. In the first half, the Pramathas and the Timis are described alike as whirling. In the second half also we expect therefore a similar description; in 'c' the fighters are said to tear each other, and in 'd' as printed, no sea-animals are mentioned. But it is said that those torn were screaming. The bulk of the manuscripts collated actually, 21 manuscripts read कन्दन्ति which spoils the metre. In nine of them कन्दन्ति is preceded by गात्राणि as object of छिन्दन्ति in 'c'. Correspondingly they introduce a variation in the end to supply the displaced तथैव and read तथैव क्रुद्धाः ; thus resulting in a double defect of the metre. गात्राणि कन्दन्ति तथैव क्रुद्धाः । From the evidence of four manuscripts, we can restore a line which is both metrically correct and rhetorically suited to the other parts of verse गात्राणि क्वन्तन्ति तथैव नक्राः ।

138-25:

25c, d read देवारिणस्तस्य पुरस्य द्वारं  
ताभ्यां तु तत्पश्चिमतो निरुद्धम्

The word द्वारं at the place where it is, creates a metrical difficulty. Except four, all our other manuscripts read in 'd', two पश्चिमास् meaning that Yama and Kubera took their stand against the Western gate at the back (of the city). As it is, the printed line adopts the passive voice. About ten manuscripts read न्यरुन्धन् in active but in plural, while we want here only dual. The reading न्यरुन्धन् may as well be a mistake for न्यरुन्धाम्, a correct dual and we can restore as तत्पश्चिमं पश्चिमतो न्यरुन्धाम् । Regarding 'c' the reading of the majority of manuscripts is against the metre. Only the Grantha and the London Malayalam Manuscripts read a metrically correct line—

द्वारं पुरस्यामरविद्धिषां तं तत्पश्चिमं पश्चिमतोपरुद्धम्, which would be alright if we restore it as—द्वारं पुरस्यामरविद्धिषस्तौ ।

138-28 :

28c—प्रक्षिप्य प्रक्षिप्य समुद्रमध्ये might be re-constructed on the basis of six manuscripts as प्रक्षिप्य चोक्षिप्य, or प्रक्षिप्य विक्षिप्य according to the Grantha manuscript. In passing, it may also be noted that without any metrical change समुद्रमध्ये is read as जलस्य मध्ये in the bulk of the manuscripts.

138-29 a,b.

Though metrically correct, the Anvaya of this line is not clear and will have to be considered later at the time of determining the text.

In 'c', again there is no metrical flaw, but the word गृहाणि in ĀSS. is syntactically difficult of interpretation. There are other readings for the word.

In 'd', आतेति creates grammatical difficulty and we may adopt आनश्च found in the two Ujjain manuscripts. But the latter word प्रियेति in the same line which creates a metrical difficulty, because of its initial conjunct consonant cannot be reconstructed, for no manuscript offers a variant for it.

138-30a.

This is vitiated by a conjunct consonant in कलत्रपुत्रक्षयप्राणनाशे. But most of the manuscripts read जीव instead of प्राण, a reading which is noted also in the foot-note in ĀSS. In one manuscript (U2) there is a marginal variant नोतल, which reads प्रिय instead of क्षय. This is obviously due to क्षय being taken as redundant with नाश. We may take क्षय also in the sense of house.

33d has an excess syllable in the ĀSS printed text. There are however, 16 manuscripts which do not have this and we can therefore read a correct Upajāti here :—

युध्यन्ति सवर्दं महदुद्गिरन्तः

36a has again a conjunct consonant in स तत्र प्राकारगतांश्च भूतान्। Except for the single manuscript P2 which changes the whole



line and reads—स तत्र गत्वा all the other manuscripts have the metrical difficulty caused by प्र.

38d offers another example of the conjunct चतुर्मुल्लो यः स त्रिलोचनश्च hindering the metre. But here again, except in two manuscripts where an effort has been made to remove the drawback, all the other manuscripts read the pāda as it is with a metrical defect caused by the conjunct consonant त्रि.

138-48 :

The first pāda is in correct Pushpitāgrā. The third pāda answers correctly to the even pāda of a Pushpitāgrā. The fourth pāda agrees with Subodhitā or Priyā which, as already pointed out, is got by the addition of a guru at the end to the Viyoginī. The remaining even pāda (i. e. Pāda 2) offers difficulty in a single syllable, the sixth. If the 6th is short, instead of being long, as it is (i. e. श्रूयति for श्रूयते) it would accord perfectly with the last pāda, though it would involve a grammatical howler. It is read with a short syllable in three manuscripts, i. e. one Grantha and two Devanāgarī: नदतां श्रूयति मित्रसागराभः We have thus here an odd metrical mixture. To make the third pāda answer to a correct even pāda of Pushpitāgrā, we have to read the name of विश्वामालिन् in the former in which it is given, namely, तडिन्मालिन् as either तडिमालि in vocative or as तडिमाल as one manuscript actually reads it. Several manuscripts reads it as 'मालि in Vocative वद वचनं तडिमालि (ल) किं किमेतत् will be the restored line.

49a is in Pushpitāgrā. 'b', as it is, is obviously modelled as 48d, Subodhitā, i. e. Viyoginī plus one Guru. But it wants one syllable and is defective in another syllable—तडिमाली रवि-रिवांशुमाली The printed line is of course appropriate from the point of view of the meaning. Five manuscripts re-construct this line with रविरेव सोऽंशु (सांशु) माली which is metrically alright. Another metrically correct restoration found in three manuscripts is रविरो यशोऽंशुमाली which reads better but by-passes the comparison of रवि which seems to be authentic.

49c-d. follows the pattern to which we are now accustomed, namely the odd Pushpitāgrā plus Viyoginī with a Guru for the even pāda.

50a. represents a correct Pushpitāgrā. For the first time in this series the Pushpitāgrā is followed for the even pāda also. Though in the ĀSS. printed text this is effected by the syllables निधिर्धौ in the middle, the metrically correct reading तव यशसां निधिरेष तारकाख्यः may be restored as in some of the manuscripts. The third pāda is correct as Pushpitāgrā. The fourth reads in the ĀSS—(युद्धा यस्तपति हि तारको गणेन्द्रैः) as a Praharṣiṇī foot but a correct Pushpitāgrā could be restored so as to fit in with the sense also युधि पतितस्य तु नन्दिना निरस्तः. It must be mentioned in passing that in the confusion the manuscripts easily succumbed to produce, with variants, a Mālinī for the second half of this verse. For the first half also an attempt to turn into Mālinī is seen but it is confined to the two Ujjain manuscripts.

51. follows the pattern which we have noted more than once of a combination of Pushpitāgrā and an augmented Viyoginī.

52. The first pāda is in the pattern of the even foot of Pushpitāgrā as in 48 c. b and d are as usual Viyoginī with the added guru. 'c' alone gives some trouble as it does not fall into Pushpitāgrā or Drutavilambita or any other recognisable metre. Most of the manuscripts read here रणशिरसि सिताज्जनाचलासः which however makes collirium white (सिताञ्जन) which is not possible. There is one manuscript which reads रणशिरसि तमज्जनावभासः but if we take the suggestion from this we can restore the line with less verbal change as follows—रणशिरसि तमज्जनाचलासो

56. It reads the second half as a correct Pushpitāgrā. But the first half is defective in both pādas. The concluding words of the verse सुराभ्यतरङ्गः should be taken as सुराः वतरङ्गः with the अ of अव dropped, according to Bhaguri's sanction.

The first pāda may be restored on the basis of the variants of larger incidence as अथ करकमुदङ्गवाद्य (शङ्ख, वंश, शंख) घोषैः.

139-25.

The first and the third pādas in the Upajāti here, are affected by a conjunct consonant द्रुत् in 'a' and प्रियां in 'c'. Unfortunately the variants available for 'a' ( द्रुत् and दिहृत् ) in three manuscripts do not help; but in 'c', the difficulty created by the conjunct consonant has been obviated by several variants : तां च प्रियां in ĀSS is available in the following variants—प्राणसमां; तां प्रियकां; तां दयितां; and प्राणसमां is the variants of largest incidence and may be adopted.

139-29.

The second pāda reads in ĀSS as विमार्गितान्या च प्रियं प्रसन्ना. Of our manuscripts, *ten* retain readings which have the idea of one of the ladies, having become favourably disposed, was searching ( विभृग् ) for her lover. On the other hand no less than *ten* give up the idea of the lady searching her lover; and following up the idea in the first pāda say that having herself drunk she made her lover also drink; i. e. in the place of विमार्गिता or विमार्गिते we have a reading

अपाययत् प्रीतिपरा ( प्रीतमनाः ) प्रियं च

It is really difficult to make a choice between these two ideas of searching the lover or making him also drink, as the evidence seems to be equal on either side. Removing the metrical difficulty caused by the conjunct consonant प्रियं in ĀSS. We may read the line either as

अपाययत् प्रीतिपरा ( प्रीतमनाः ) प्रियं च or  
विमार्गितेऽन्या प्रियकां प्रसन्ना (प्रयत्नात्)

139-43

As read in the ĀSS., the second and third pādas of this verse are in 'Śalinī'; the first pāda mixes 'Śalinī'; and Upajāti and the fourth pāda is in pure Upajāti. The evidence of the

manuscripts would lead to the restoration of a complete Upajāti rather than to the maintenance of Upajāti-cum-Śalini. But even so the clue given by the variants is not clear enough. For, with the exception of one manuscript which reads भिन्न, all the others read छिन्न. And whether it is छिन्न or भिन्न, the Upajāti is all the same spoiled. In ĀSS itself, in the foot-note, an attempt to re-construct the Upajāti for the whole Ardha is to be seen—

आन्दोलनाद्भ्रंशितछिन्नसूत्रकाञ्चीकलापच्युतरत्नकीर्णः

However, here also छिन्न is not eliminated. From this we may generally observe that the North-Indian scribes often failed to note the metrical difficulty created by a conjunct consonant which converts the previous laghu into guru. In the course of our foregoing examination, we have drawn attention to this as a rather persisting tendency.

139-45

As printed in Āss. this verse reads the second, third and fourth pādas in correct Pushpitāgrā, but for the first pāda alone it has a finally augmented Viyoginī. A large number of manuscripts do not read in the first pāda a mere पुरे but have त्रिपुरपुरे which would support a Pushpitāgrā re-construction. A reading इति त्रिपुरपुरेऽमरद्विषाणं would offend both metre and grammar, the conjunct consonant त्रि being detrimental metrically and द्विषाणं being grammatically unsound. Only a tentative re-construction is possible out of the sum-total of the words available in the variants which may read in correct Pushpitāgrā:

त्रिपुरपुर इति द्विषां सुराणां

The last foot, though metrically alright, creates a difficulty in grammar, namely the Visandhi between ..... क्षया and अरौणाम्. However, besides ĀSS, eleven manuscripts support this reading. Twelve manuscripts substitute भवदुरौः with दनुदितिजान्, transferring the idea of क्षरि from the end of the line to the beginning. This they do obviously to make the sense that the moon

laughed at the demons and therefore insert the idea of हास at the end of the line. Such a variant is due to a clear misunderstanding of the sense. What is meant by the text is that along with the demons who went down in the battle, the moon or moon-light also, at the end of the night, went down. Further दनुदितिजान्, an accusative plural, cannot be kept, as a genitive plural is required. Two manuscripts which realise this difficulty read hyper-metrically दनुदितिजनुषां which can go only as an odd Pushpitāgrā foot and not an even one. In view of all this confusion भवतुरगैः कृतसंक्षया अरीणां resting on the ĀSS and eleven of our manuscripts may be retained, with its visandhi.

*(To be continued)*

A REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE PURĀṆA-DEPTT.  
OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST.

By

ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

[सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागे यत्कार्यजातमद्यावधि कृतं, तस्य संक्षिप्तं विवरणमत्र प्रकाश्यते । इतोऽपि पूर्वं पुराणविभागकार्यस्य किञ्चिद् विवरणं 'पुराण' पत्रिकायाः प्रथमभागस्य प्रथमेऽङ्के प्रकाशितम्, तत्तु तत्रैव द्रष्टव्यम् । अधुना मत्स्यपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकं संस्करणं डा० वे० राघवन्महोदयैर्मद्रासनगरे सम्पाद्यते, तच्च शीघ्रमेव प्रकाशमानमिष्यते । वामनपुराणस्यापि तादृशं संस्करणमत्र वाराणस्यां काशीविश्वविद्यालये डा० वासुदेवशरण-अग्रवालमहोदयैः सम्पाद्यते, तदर्थं च ये सप्त प्राचीनकोशाः पुराण-विभागेऽद्यावधि संवादिताः, तेषां विवरणमप्यत्र प्रदीयते । पूर्वनिर्मितमत्स्य-पुराणश्लोकसूचीवत् वामनपुराणश्लोकचरणानां वर्णक्रमानुसारिणी सूच्यपि निर्मिता । एका बृहती 'पुराण विषय-सूची' चापि निर्मायते, यस्य निर्माणयोजना पूर्वमेव 'पुराण' पत्रिकायां प्रकाशिता ( भाग १, अङ्क १ ) । अस्मिन्नङ्के वामनपुराणस्य समग्रा विषय-सूची निदर्शनार्थं प्रकाशयते । पुराणविषयाणामनुसंधानाय 'वेद-व्यास-महोदय-मन्दिर' नाम्नी संस्थाऽप्येका शीघ्रमेवोद्घाटयिष्यते, यस्या अपि किञ्चिद्विवरणमस्मिन्नङ्के पृथक् प्रदीयते । ]

The importance of Puranic studies has been engaging the attention of Indologists both in India and abroad for the last several decades. Some valuable work has also been done in the field of Purāṇic research. But the value of all such research-work depends mainly on the efficiency of the essential tools of research. Critical recensions of the Purāṇa-texts prepared according to the modern principles of textual criticism are the foremost necessity for carrying out any kind of research on the Purāṇas. Besides, a detailed Purāṇa-Concordance of proper names of persons and places and of various subjects dealt with in the Purāṇas, an alphabetical Index of all the Ślokas of the Purāṇas, a list of Purāṇa-Ślokas found quoted in the various Commentaries and Digests of the Dharmasāstras or Smṛitis, and an exhaustive Lexicon of the special terminology

of the Purāṇas also form essential reference-works needed for the comparative and critical studies of the Purāṇas.

With a view to further the studies of the Purāṇas and the Purāṇic research the All-India Kashiraj Trust has undertaken, through its Purāṇa Department, to provide such and other essential material and reference-works. It has also done some important work in this direction, and a brief report of its work has already appeared in its "Purāṇa" Bulletin, VOL. I, pp. 16-20. The following is the further account of the work done in the Purāṇa Department,

### 1. Critical Editions :

(1) The Critical Edition of the *Matsya Purāṇa* is being prepared by Dr. V. Raghavan of the Madras University at Madras on the basis of the collation of some thirty manuscripts procured from various places of India and abroad (a detailed description of these Mss. has been given in "Purāṇa" Vol. I, pp. 101-111). Besides these thirty Mss., three palm-leaf Mss. and one paper Ms.—all deposited in the Oriental Research Institute of Mysore—are also being collated at Mysore by the Assistant Pandits of Dr. V. Raghavan. The Telgu edition of the *Matsya Purāṇa*, and also the Tamil-verse Translation by Vadamalayappa Pillai, which is about 300 years old, have also been utilised (see for details, "Purāṇa" Vol. I, No. 1., p. 18)

(2) The next Purāṇa taken up for its critical edition is the *Vāmana Purāṇa*. The work of preparing its Critical Edition has been entrusted to Dr. Vasudeva Sharan Agrawala of the Banaras Hindu University. Fourteen manuscripts of the *Vāmana Purāṇa* have yet been procured, as detailed below :—

- 2 Devanāgarī Mss. from the Sarasvati Bhandara, Fort Ramnagar (Varanasi).
- 3 Devanāgarī Mss. from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- 2 Devanāgarī Mss. from the Bharatiya Itihasa Samsodhaka Mandala, Poona.

- 2 Devanāgarī Mss. from the India Office Library, London.  
 1 Devanāgarī Ms. from the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta  
 1 Beṅgalā Ms. " " " " " "  
 1 Śaradā Ms. from the Banaras Hindu University Library  
 1 Devanāgarī Ms. " " " " " "  
 1 Devanāgarī Ms. (Microfilm) from the Pennsylvania University (U. S. A.).

Out of these, the following Mss. have been collated :—

1. No. 54/183 of the Sarasvati Bhandara, Fort Ramnagar ; Devanāgarī, folios 180, complete, undated, but the following Śloka has been written on its cover page :

स्पर्शितं वामनमिदं द्वीपांगवसुचन्द्रके ।

वर्षे द्वाषादशुक्लीयत्रयोदश्यर्कवासरे ॥

So it belongs latest to Saṁvat 1867 (A. D. 1810).

2. No. 19 of 1873-74 of the BORI., Poona ; Devanāgarī, folios 203, a few folios missing, otherwise complete, dated Saṁvat 1839 (A. D. 1782), written in Bikaner by Purohita Śrīkrishṇa.

3. No. 78 of 1882-83 (New No. 33) of BORI., Poona ; Devanāgarī, folios 254, complete, dated Saṁvat 1714 (A. D. 1657).

4. No. 25.227 of BISM, Poona ; Devanāgarī, folios 270, complete, dated Saṁvat 1785 (A. D. 1728).

5. No. E. 3584 of IO, London ; Devanāgarī, folios 170, complete, dated Saṁvat 1862 (A. D. 1805).

6. No. E. 3585 of IO, London ; Devanāgarī, folios 208, complete ; (collated Bhuvana-Kośa chapters only.)

7. No. 1447 of Pennsylvania University ; microfilm ; Devanāgarī, folios 132, complete, dated Śaka-Saṁvat 1679 (A. D. 1757).

Besides these a Telugu Ms. of the Vamana Purana (No. D. 2263) deposited in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, is also being collated there under the supervision of Dr. V. Raghavan.



## II. Collation of the Brahmapurāṇa Mss.

With a view to prepare its critical edition in near future, some manuscripts of the Brahmapurāṇa were also procured from the Kashiraj Sarasvati Bhandara, Fort Ramnagar, University Library, Bombay, and Oriental Institute, Baroda. Of these, the following two Mss. have yet been collated :—

1—No. 23/184 of the Sarasvati Bhandara, Fort Ramnagar; Devanāgarī, folios 368, complete, dated Samvat 1833 (A. D. 1776), (contains Gautamī-Māhātmya also),

2—No. 12885 of the Oriental Institute, Baroda; Devanāgarī, folios 315 by counting, some folios missing, otherwise complete, dated Samvat 1709 (A.D. 1652); (does not contain Gautamī-Māhātmya).

## III. Śloka-Indexes.

Almost all the Purāṇas have been drawn upon by the writers of Dharmaśāstra-Digests and also by Smṛiti-commentators in their works. These quotations are very helpful in ascertaining and constituting the texts of the Purāṇas. In order to search the quotations of the Purāṇa-Ślokas in these Digests and Commentaries, an alphabetical Index of the Śloka-ardhas of the Matsya Purāṇa, and alphabetical Indexes of the Śloka-pādas of the Vāmana and the Brahma have been prepared. With the help of the Matsya-Purāṇa Śloka-Index the Matsya-quotations have already been collected from the Nibandha-granthas and the Smṛiti-commentaries under the guidance of Padma Bhushan Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri, Dravid (for details *vide* "Purāṇa" Vol. I, p. 19).

## IV. Purāṇa-Concordance.

A proper and comprehensive subject-index of all the Mahāpurāṇas is a long-felt desideratum. The way to prepare such indexes had already been shown by the Vedic Index of Prof. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, and by the Mahābhārata-Index of Dr. Sorenson. Prof. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar of the Madras University prepared his famous Purāṇa-Index in three Volumes (published by the Madras University, 1951-55).

But it is primarily an index of proper names of persons, places, tīrthas etc., and of a few Purāṇic terms and subjects, such as *aṅjali*, *ābhātasamplava*, *sarga* etc., the treatment of which is very brief and insufficient. Moreover, Prof. Dikshitar has indexed only the five Mahāpurāṇas, viz. the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa, the Viṣṇu, the Matsya and the Bhāgavata. Another important Purāṇa-Index, viz. पुराणविषयसमञ्जसमणिका (A Concordance of Purāṇa-contents), was also prepared by Sri Yashpal Tandon, and has been published by the Visheshavaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, in 1952. It is arranged in twelve prakaraṇas according to the subject-matter of the Purāṇas. Although it covers most of the subjects dealt with in the Purāṇas, yet its treatment is extremely compact and sketchy. It gives references only without any details or descriptions. It has been, later on, revised by Srikantha Kaula, who has inserted in it the names of the kings of the dynasties of the Kaliyuga on the basis of Pargiter's list given in his *Purāṇa-Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, the names of the Jātis or peoples based on the '*Text of the Purāṇic list of peoples*' by Dr. D. C. Sircar, and also the names of the rivers based on the '*Text of the Purāṇic List of Rivers*' by the same Author, but it is still wanting in necessary details and descriptions of other topics referred to in this Index.

The All-India Kashiraj Trust has planned for the preparation of an exhaustive and comprehensive Subject-Concordance of all the Mahāpurāṇas including the Śiva and the Devī-Bhāgavata, and of some of the important Upapurāṇas and the Harivaṁśa, giving all the necessary details and descriptions of each item. The work of preparing this Purāṇa-Concordance has been entrusted to Sri Ramshankar Bhattacharya, M. A., Vyākaraṇāchārya, who has been compiling this Concordance under the guidance of M. M. Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, Dr. Mangal Deva Shastri, and Dr. V. S. Agrawala. This Concordance has been divided into ten principal Khaṇḍas which have been further subdivided into Vibhāgas and Prakaraṇas according to the nature and the extent of the subjects (for details see 'Purāṇa' Vol. I, No. 1). The Concordance work on *pratisarga* has already

been published in the 'Purāṇa' Vol. I. No. 2. In this present issue of the "Purāṇa" the full Subject-Concordance of the Vāmana Purāṇa is being published. Work on the other Purāṇas is also going on on the same lines. All this Concordance-work on the separate Purāṇas will later on be re-adjusted and combined into a single whole. It is proposed to invite suggestions from scholars to make the work more useful for Puranic research.

#### V. 'Purāṇa' Bulletin.

To facilitate the special study of the Purāṇas and to provide an exclusive forum for the contributions by scholars interested in the Purāṇic study and research the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin has been started by the 'Purāṇa Prakāśana Samiti' of the Kashiraj Trust. It is an half-yearly Journal published every year on the Vasanta Pañchamī (Jan-Feb.) and the Vyāsa Pūrṇimā (July-Aug.). The first issue (Vol. I, No. 1) was edited by Dr. V. Raghavan and published at Madras in July 1959. But owing to some inconvenience felt in editing and printing this Journal at Madras, it was decided by His Highness, the Chairman of the Kashiraj Trust, that the work of the editing and printing of its subsequent issues should be done at Varanasi. Accordingly the next issue (No. 2 of Vol. I.), due on the last Vasant Pañchamī (Feb., 1960), was edited by Dr. V.S. Agrawala and printed at Varanasi. The two numbers of Vol. I contained, in 250 pages, valuable contributions from learned scholars. The first Number was appreciated by such learned scholars as Dr. Sunitikumar Chatterji and Prof. P. V. Kane, whose opinions appear on the 2nd page of the cover of No. 2 of the I Volume. It was also reviewed by such standard Dailies as the 'Hindu' of Madras and the 'Patrikā' of Calcutta, and also by some Indian and foreign Journals. The second number of this volume was also appreciated by such eminent foreign scholars, as Prof. W. Kirfel (Germany), Prof. Dr. Gonda (Holland), and Prof. Dr. Juan Roger (Spain); their opinions also appear on the 2nd cover-page of Vol. II of the "Purāṇa", which was published as a composite issue of both its numbers, in 320 pages, on the last Vyāsa Pūrṇimā day (July 8, 1960).

The composite issue of Vol. II of the Purāṇa has also received appreciation from Prof. Hideo Kimura (Japan), Dr. Giuseppe Tucci (Istituto Italiano, Rome), Dr. C. Hooykass (London) and others. Dr. J. Gonda contributed also his learned article on the 'Old Javanese Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa' to this composite issue. Dr. Janu Rager has also contributed a very thoughtful article in the present issue (Vol. III. No. 1) of the 'Purāṇa', which is going to be published on the coming Vasanta Pañchamī day (Jan. 21, 1961). Dr. Kufel, Dr. Kimura, Dr. Tucci and other Indian and foreign scholars have also shown their readiness to contribute their learned articles to the 'Purāṇa'. On account of his ill health Dr. V. S. Agrawala has not been able, this time, to contribute further instalments of his articles published in the previous issues of the 'Purāṇa'. But we hope that he will soon recoup his health and will be able to benefit the readers, interested in the Purāṇas, by his learned articles.

The All-India Kashiraj Trust is trying through its Bulletin "Purāṇa" to propagate the Puranic learning and to encourage the research on the Purāṇas; and this endeavour of the Trust is receiving wide appreciation from the scholars of different countries, who are lending their whole-hearted co-operation to the cause.

---

# पुराण-विषयसूची (Puranic Concordance)

( श्री रामशंकर भट्टाचार्य )

[The Subject-Concordance of the Vāmana Purāṇa is published here for soliciting the suggestions from scholars. It forms a part of the *Purāṇa-Concordance* which is being prepared under the auspices of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. A brief outline of the plan of the *Purāṇa-Concordance* has already been published in the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 39-41. It is divided into ten Khaṇḍas, as indicated there. The Vāmana-Purāṇa-Concordance, which is published here, has been prepared according to the same plan. The references are from the Venkateshvara Press edition of the Vāmana-Purāṇa. Cross-references are also indicated, where-ever necessary]

अस्यां वामनपुराणविषयसूच्यां सर्वे खलु वामनपुराणगता विषयाः सप्रकरणका निवेशिताः । क्वचित् प्राचीनहस्तलेखानां साहाय्येन वैकुण्ठेश्वर-मुद्रितवामनपुराणपुस्तकस्य पाठसंशोधनमप्यावश्यकतानुसारं कृतं तथैव सूचितं च । उपात्तविषयाणां विवरणमप्यत्र दीयते । मुख्यचरितान्तःपातिगौणचरितस्थल-निर्देशाय क्वचिद् मुख्यस्थलस्थ संकेतोऽपि दत्तः । अन्यान्यपि कानिचित् प्रकरणानि यथाकालमत्र संयोजयिष्यन्ते—इति निवेद्यते ।

अस्यां सूच्यां प्रयुक्तसंकेतानां विवरणमधो दीयते —

१. आकरस्थलनिर्देशे स्थूलोऽङ्कः अध्यायसंख्याज्ञापकः, तदनन्तरं सूक्ष्मोऽङ्कश्च श्लोकसंख्याज्ञापकः ।
२. आकरस्थलनिर्देशे 'द्र०' शब्देन 'द्रष्टव्यम्' इत्यवगन्तव्यम् ।
३. [ ] एतादृशे कोष्ठके पदार्थपरिचयः संनिवेशितः, टिप्पण्यादि च दत्तम् ।
४. ( ) एतादृशे लघुकोष्ठके पदार्थविवरणं दत्तम् ।
५. — इति 'वैश' चिह्नं विषयव्याप्तिद्योतकम् ।

## वामनपुराणम्

( वैकुण्ठेश्वरप्रेससंस्करणम् )

### प्रथमः खण्डः—सर्ग-प्रतिसर्गौ

#### (१) विभागः—सर्गः

ब्रह्मकर्तृकः [तीर्थमाहात्म्यान्तर्गतः]

—वर्णाश्रमसृष्टिः

३६।२१-२३

—अण्डविभागः, पृथिव्युत्पत्तिः, ब्रह्मोत्पत्तिः, वर्णसृष्टिः,

बाललिल्यादिसृष्टिश्च

४३।१६-४४

भगवत्कर्तृकः [ दक्षयज्ञकथान्तर्गतः ]

( एकाग्रैवान्ते सृष्टिः, ब्रह्म-शिवयोः राजस-तामसत्वे च )

२।२१-२५

#### (२) विभागः—प्रतिसर्गः

[ अत्र प्रतिसर्गप्रकरणं नास्ति ]

### द्वितीयः खण्डः—तीर्थ-भूगोल-भुवनकोशाः

#### (१) विभागः—तीर्थम्

तीर्थसामान्यम्

—तीर्थसूची

( विष्णुस्थानानि अधिष्ठातृनामभिः सह )

६०।१-४८

—तीर्थयात्रा

( प्रह्लादकृतानेकतीर्थगमनम् )

७८।१-८४।५०

( पृथिव्यम्बररसातले त्रीणि श्रेष्ठानि तीर्थानि )

७।३६-३७

विशिष्टतीर्थ-क्षेत्र-पुण्यस्थानमाहात्म्यादि ( विशिष्टाधिष्ठातृदेवनामसाहितम् )

—अदितिकनम्

( कुलक्षेत्रस्वप्नसदनेष्वन्यतमम्, माहात्म्यं च )

३४।१-५; १२-१३

—काम्पुनदी

( कुलक्षेत्रस्या, काम्पुनदीष्वन्यतमा )

३४।६-८

## —अवकीर्णम्

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थं, वक्रदाल्भ्यचरितं च )

३६।२४-३५

## —असिनदी [ 'आसी' मुद्रितः पाठः ] ;

( योगशायिवामचरणप्रवाहिता वाराणसीस्था )

३।२६-२८

## —अस्यजन्म

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम्, शरभरूपिशिवनृसिंहचरिते च )

३६।२८-४०

## —आपगानदी [ कुरुक्षेत्रस्था ]

( सप्तनदीष्वन्यतमा )

३४।६-८

( एतन्माहात्म्यम् )

३६।१-६

## —इरावती नदी

( माहात्म्यं, पुरुवरसःकथा च )

७६।७-८४

## —औशनसम् [=कपालमोचनम्]

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम्, रहोदरमुनिसिद्धिस्थानम् )

३९।१-१४

## —कनखलम्

( दक्षयज्ञस्थलम् )

४।१८

## —कपालमोचनम् [=औशनसम्, इ० ]

३६।१-१४

## —कपिलः [ यक्षः ]

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थः )

३४।४४

## —काम्यकवनम्

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम्, सप्तवनेष्वन्यतमम् )

३४।१-५

## —कालिन्दी [ = यमुना, इ० ]

## —काशी

( वर्णनम् )

३।२५-४१

## —कुरुक्षेत्रम्

( कुरुक्षेत्रान्तर्गततीर्थानां वर्णनं, माहात्म्यसंबद्धकथाश्च )

२१।२४—५०।१३

## —कुरुजाङ्गलम् [ = कुरुक्षेत्रम्, २२।४०-४७ ]

( खगस्थचक्रपाणिस्थितिरत्र )

३।१२

( सर्वक्षेत्रश्रेष्ठम् )	१२।४५
( वामनोत्पत्तिस्थलम् )	२३।२
—केदारः [ हिमालयस्थः ]	
( उत्पत्तिः, माहात्म्यं च )	६०।१-१६
—कौशिकी नदी	
( कुरुक्षेत्रस्था, सप्तनदीष्वन्यतमा )	३४।६-८
—गया	
( स्थितिः, वर्णनं च )	७६।१४-१८
—दशाश्वमेधम्	
( वाराणसीस्थम् )	३।४१
—दुर्गा [ देवता ]	
( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थकलसीनदीतटस्था )	३६।१९
—दृषद्वती नदी	
( सरस्वतीदृषद्वत्योरन्तरे कुरुजाङ्गलस्थितिः )	२२।४७
—द्वैतवनम्	
( सरस्वतीप्रवाहोष्णः हृदोऽप्यस्ति )	२२।१२-१४
—नरनारायणस्थानम्	
( इदं हिमालयस्थवदरिकाश्रमः )	२।४२-४३
—नागहृदः	
( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थः, ब्रह्मसरसो नामान्तरम् )	३२।२४
—नैमिषम्	
( पुण्डरीकाक्षस्थानम् )	७।३९
( गोमती-वाञ्चनाक्षी-शुभदानयः, पीतवाससः स्थितिश्चात्र )	८३।१-४
—फ्योष्णी नदी	
( पुष्करनाभस्थानम् )	६३।८६
—पुण्यशक्तिवनम्	
( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम्, सप्तवनेष्वन्यतमम् )	३४।१-५
—पृथूदक्षसरः	
( इदं सर्वतीर्थश्रेष्ठम् )	१२।४५



- ( कुरुक्षेत्रमध्यस्थम् ) २२।४४-४६  
 ( सरःप्रमाणम्, संबद्धविवरणं च ) २२।४७-६०  
 [ कुरुक्षेत्रमाहात्म्येऽप्यन्तराऽन्तराऽस्थोल्लेखः ]
- प्रयागः  
 ( बट-रुद्र-माधव-योगशायिस्थितिरत्र ) ८३।२७-२९
- फलकीवनम्  
 ( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम्, सप्तवनेष्वन्यतमम् ) ३४।१-५
- बदरिकाश्रमः  
 ( हिमालयस्थः, नरनारायणस्थानम् ) २।४३-४४  
 ( हिमालये गङ्गातटस्थः, नरनारायणतपःस्थानम् ) ६।३-४
- ब्रह्मयोनिः [अत्र क्लीबत्वमपि स्याद् दीर्घकारान्तत्वं वा]  
 ( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थाः, पुराऽत्र ब्रह्मकर्तृकः सर्गोऽपि ) ३६।२०-२४
- ब्रह्मवेदिः [ = स्यमन्तपञ्चकम् ]  
 ( कुरुक्षेत्रस्था ) २२।१५
- ब्रह्मसरः  
 ( इदं कुरुक्षेत्रस्थं पृथूदकसरः ) २२।४०-६०  
 ( इदं कुरुक्षेत्रम् ) ३२।३४
- ब्रह्मावर्तः  
 ( सरस्वतीद्विषद्वतीमध्यस्थदेशः ) ३३।९
- मधुनन्दिनीनदी  
 ( चक्रधरशिव-शूलबाहुविष्णु-चरिते च ) ८१।१६-८२।४८
- मधुवनम्  
 ( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम्, सप्तवनेष्वन्यतमम् ) ३४।१-५
- यमुना  
 ( जलकृष्णत्वकारणम् ) ६।२६-३१
- रन्तुकः (अरन्तुकः ?) [ यक्षः ]  
 ( द्वारपालः कुरुक्षेत्रस्थः ) ३४।११  
 ( रन्तुकं प्राप्य सरस्वती कुरुक्षेत्रं समाश्लान्य  
 पश्चिमवाहिनी ) ३३।१-२;  
 ( अस्य माहात्म्यं च ) ३३।१९-२१, ३५।३७-३८

—रामहृदः

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थः, परशुरामचरितं च )

—लोलार्कः [ देवः ]

( वाराणसीस्थः )

( सूर्यस्य वाराणस्यां पतनं, शिवकृतलोलनामकरणम् )

—वरणानदी [ वाराणसीस्था ]

( योगशायिदक्षिणचरणप्रवाहिता )

—वशिष्ठोद्गाहः

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थः, वसिष्ठचरितेन सह )

३६।

—वाराणसी

( वर्णनम्, लोलार्कस्थितिश्च )

( इदं हरिक्षेत्रं, एतत्परिमाणं, लोलार्कस्थितिश्च )

( मुक्तकेशव-लोलस्थितिरत्र )

—विन्ध्यपर्वतः

( कौशिकीदेवीनिवासस्थानम् )

—विहारः [ कुरुक्षेत्रस्थः ]

( अयं मदनतीर्थम्, अस्य माहात्म्यं च )

—वेदवती

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थं तीर्थम् )

—वैतरणीनदी

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्था, सप्तनदीष्वन्यतमा )

—व्यासवनम्

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम्, सप्तवनेष्वन्यतमम् )

—श्रीकण्ठः [ देवः ]

( कालिन्दी-दक्षिणोत्तरस्थः )

( यमुनातटस्थः )

—श्वेतद्वीपः

( श्रीरोदस्थविष्णुस्थानम् )

—सञ्जिहितसरः = पुण्ड्रकम्

( कुरुक्षेत्रमाहात्म्येऽन्यत्राप्युक्तं कथनमस्ति )

## —सप्तसारस्वतम्

( सप्तसरस्वतीनामानि, मङ्कणकचरितं च )

३७/१७-३८/२३

## —सरस्वतीनदी

[ कुरुक्षेत्रमाहात्म्येऽन्तराऽन्तरास्या उल्लेखोऽस्ति ]

( सरस्वतीदृषद्वत्यन्तरे कुरुजाट्गलस्थितिः )

२२/४७

( उत्पत्तिः, कुरुक्षेत्रेऽस्याः प्रवाहः पश्चिमदिशगमनं च, )

३२/१-३३/२१

( सप्तसारस्वतीनामानि, मङ्कणकचरितं च )

३७/१७-३८/२३

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थसप्तनदीष्वन्यतमा )

३४/६-८

( सरस्वतीकनृकचसिष्ठाश्रमल्लावनम् )

४०/१-४५

( सरस्वतीगतिवर्णनं, विहारादितीर्थानि च )

४२/१-३०

## —सूर्यवनम्

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थम् )

३४/१-५

## —स्थाणुतीर्थम्

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्थं, ब्रह्मचरितादिभिः सह )

४३/१-४६/५१

## —स्यमन्तपञ्चकम्

( इह ब्रह्मवेदि, अस्य परिमाणादि )

२२/१५-६०

## —हारकेश्वरः

( गोदावरीस्थः )

६५/१२७

## —हिरण्वतीनदी

( कुरुक्षेत्रस्था, सप्तनदीष्वन्यतमा )

३४/६-८

## (२) विभागः—भूगोलः [ भूतत्त्वभूप्रदेशादयः ]

भूसामान्यम्

## —पृथ्वी

( भूपरिमाणं, सप्तद्वीपसमुद्राश्च )

११/३१-४६

भौगोलिकस्थानम् [ तीर्थत्वेन यत्र प्रोक्तम् ]

## —उदयगिरिः

( अत्र शरयणमस्ति )

५७/१५

- कापिलवनम्  
( शिवदेशसमीपस्थम् ) ६४।१२-१३
- त्रिकूटपर्वतः  
( वर्णनम् ) ८५।४-१८
- दण्डकारण्यम्  
( शुक्रशापाद् भस्मीभूतम् ) ६५।१७-१८
- मद्रदेशः  
( शाकलनगरमन्नास्ति ) ७६।१२
- मन्दरपर्वतः  
( शिवनिवासस्थानम् ) १।११; ६६।४२-४४
- मरुभूमिः  
( शाकलनगरसौराष्ट्रयोर्मार्गेऽस्ति ) ७६।१२-१५
- मलयपर्वतः  
( वर्णनम् ) ७१।४-७
- विन्ध्यपर्वतः  
( अगस्त्येन नीचशृङ्गः कृतः ) १८।२२-३७  
( कौशिकीकर्तृ कशुम्भादिवधोऽत्र ) २१।३-४
- शरवणम्  
( उदयगिरिस्थं, कार्तिकेयजन्मस्थानम् ) ५७।१५-२१
- शाकलनगरम्  
( मद्रदेशस्थम् ) ७६।१२
- शाल्किनीनदी  
( एतन्समीपे सुगुल्माढ्यं वनमस्ति ) ६४।३
- शिवदेशः  
( कालिन्दीतटस्थः ) ६४।१२
- सीतानदी  
( अष्टवसुसर्पणादस्या उत्पत्तिः ) ५।२
- सुतलम् [ पातालम् ]  
( बलिस्थानम् ) ३१।७१

## (३) विभाग :—भुवनकोशः

जनपदः

—भारतवर्षीया जनपदाः १३।३६-५९

द्वीपः

—जम्बूद्वीपसंस्थानम् १३।१-८

—पुष्करद्वीपः [ नरकवर्णनेन सह; नेदं विवरणं  
भुवनकोशप्रकरणगतम् ] ११।४७-५८

—नवद्वीपाः, भारतवर्षीयाः १३।८-११

नदी

—भारतवर्षीया नद्यः १३।२०-३५

पर्वतः

—भारतवर्षीयाः १३।१४-१९

पृथिवी

—परिमाणम्, सप्तद्वीपसमुद्राश्च  
[ नेदं भुवनकोशप्रकरणीयम्, भुवनकोशविवरणवदिदम् ] ११।३१-४६

वर्षम्

—भारतम् [ नवद्वीप-पर्वत-नदी-जनपद-विवरणेन सह ] १३।८-५९

## तृतीयः खण्डः—विद्याः, शास्त्राणि च

ज्योतिषम्

[ भुवनकोशीयज्योतिषं नात्र ]

## —नक्षत्रम्

( कालरूपिषिवाङ्मेषु स्थितानां नक्षत्राणां वर्णनम् ) ५।३०-४३

( नक्षत्ररूपिविष्णुवर्णनम् ; द्र० नक्षत्रपुरुषव्रतम् ) ८०।१-३९

## —राशिः

( राशिस्वरूपम् ) ५।४४-६०

[ स्थानसञ्चारैः सह, द्र० नक्षत्रम् ५।३०-४३ ]

पुराणम्

## —वामनपुराणम्

( वक्त्रुश्रोत्रनामनी पुलस्यनारदौ )	११२
( अस्यादिम-प्रदनाः, वामन-प्रह्लादचरित-सतीविवाह-तीर्थ-दानव्रतादयः )	११२-८
( इदं चतुर्दशम् )	६५१३६
( अस्य फलश्रुतिः )	६५१८५-९२

शैवशास्त्रम्

## —कपालिकं, कालदमनं, पाशुपतं, शैवं च

( आचार्याणां नामानि, तच्छिष्याणां नामानि च )	६१८६-९१
[ कालदमनं (६-८७) इत्यस्य 'कालवदनं' इति शुद्धः पाठः सर्वेषु संवादितहस्त-लिखितपुस्तकेषु वर्तते ; 'कालास्य' ( ६।९० क ) इत्यपि द्रष्टव्यः ।	

सङ्गीतनीविद्या

( शिवेन शुकाय दत्ता )	६२।४०-४४
-----------------------	----------

**चतुर्थः खण्डः—धर्मदर्शनसम्प्रदायाः**

## कपालिकम्

—आचार्यनाम, शैवशास्त्रादिनामभिः सह	६१८६-९१
------------------------------------	---------

## कर्म

—नरकप्रापकम् ( संबद्धविषयेन सह )	१२।१-५७
----------------------------------	---------

## कालः

—कालरूपिशिवस्वरूपम्	५।२९-४३
---------------------	---------

## कालदमनम्

—आचार्यनाम, शैवशास्त्रादिनामभिः सह,	६१८६-९१
( इदं कालवदनं स्यात्, ६।९० श्लोके कालास्यपदमस्ति )	
[ तृतीयखण्डस्थं शैवशास्त्रपदं द्रष्टव्यम् ]	

## धर्मः

—धर्मसर्वस्वम् ( आत्मकर्मशुद्ध्यादिविषयकम् )	४३।७८-८९
--	----------

—जातिधर्मः	१११४-२८
( देव-दैत्य-सिद्ध-गन्धर्व-विद्याधर-किम्पुरुष-पितृ-आर्ष-मानव-गुह्यक- राक्षस-पिशाचानां धर्माः )	
—दशाङ्गः ( अहिंसा सत्यादिमयः सार्ववर्णिकः )	१४११-२
—धर्मप्रकाराः ( अहिंसासत्यादयः त्रयोदश, द्र० १५१५ )	१५१२-३
—धर्मव्यवस्थापनम् ( असितदेवर्षिमतम् )	६६१२८-३९
—श्रेयो-निरूपणप्रसङ्गे धर्मनिरूपणम्	११११०-२८
<b>नरकम्</b>	
—नरकविवरणम् ( पुष्करद्वीपसम्बन्धि )	१११४७-५८
—कर्माणि ( नरकप्रापकाणि )	१२११-५७
—पापानां नरकरूपत्वम् ( पुत्रशिष्यनिरूपणेन सह )	६१११-४९
<b>पापम्</b>	
नरकाख्यानि दुराचरणानि ( सम्बद्धविषयैः सह )	६१११-२९
<b>पाशुपतम्</b>	
—शास्त्राचार्यनाम, ( शैवशास्त्रादिनामभिः सह )	६१८६-९१
<b>भक्तिः</b>	
—विष्णुभक्तिः	६४१२८-७६
<b>महाव्रतम्</b>	
—कपालिकशास्त्रम् ; महाव्रती धनदः तत्पुत्राश्च ; शैवादि शास्त्रैः सह	६१८६-९१
<b>योगः</b>	
—द्वादशपत्रकः ( ओ नमो भगवते बाह्युदेवायेति द्वादशाक्षरेषु विष्णुशरीरावयवराशिसादीनां स्थितिः )	६११५०-६७
—मौनमहायोगः कपिलाय सनत्कुमारं उक्तः	६०१६८-७१
[ अत्र केवलं नाम, न किमापि योगविवरणम् ]	
<b>विष्णुः</b>	
—विष्णोश्चतुर्मुर्तित्वम् ( द्वादशपत्रकयोगेन सनत्कुमारचरितेन च सह )	६०१६२-६११७२
—हरिहरैक्यरूपम्	६२१२७-३१
—हरिहरभेदकथनम्	६७१२६-५९
—विष्णुनिवासस्थानम्	८६१५५-५९
[ नेदं तीर्थविषयकम् ; ९० अध्याये तीर्थसूची विद्यते ]	

शिवः

- शिवसम्बन्धीनि शास्त्राणि (शैव-पाण्डुपत-कालवदन [= कालवदन]  
कपालिक नामधेयानि, तत्तत्तच्छास्त्राणाम् आचार्याः शक्ति-भरद्वाज-  
आपस्तम्बश्चनदनामधेयाश्चतुःशिष्यनामभिः सह )  
—हरिहरैक्यरूपम्  
—हरिहरभेदादिकथनम्  
—कालरूपि-शिवस्वरूपम्

६१८८-९१

६२१२७-३१

६७१२६-९९

५१२९-४३

### पञ्चमः खण्डः—आचार-कर्मकाण्डौ

आश्रमः

- आश्रमसृष्टिः ( व्रतणा )  
—चतुराश्रमधर्मः ( विप्रसम्बन्धी. सदाचारेण सह ;  
अन्तिमांशे वर्णान्तरप्रसङ्गश्च )

३९१२१-२३

१४१२-१२१

कथञ्चम्

- वैष्णवपञ्जरम्  
—विष्णुपञ्जरम्

१७१२६-३७

८६१९-२९

तपः

- तप्तकृच्छ्रविधानम्  
( व्रतमिदं ६२११९; ८-१४ अपि द्र० )

६२११५-१८

दानम्

- विष्णुप्रीत्यर्थदानानि, दिग्बर्चनादिभिः सह  
—दानसंहिता

६५१५-६

३१११८-३५

पापाचारः ( द्र० नरकप्रकरणमपि )

- नरकप्रापकं कर्म

१२११-५७

पुत्रः

- पुत्रलक्षणम् नरकपापादिभिः सह  
—पुत्रप्रकार-लक्षणानि,

६०१७५-६१२९

६११३४-४६

पूजा

- विष्णुपूजा ( अर्थे क्रियायोगः ९५१६७; द्र० ९५१६८ अपि ;  
विष्णुप्रिय-पुष्पादिभिः सह )

६५११-६७



मन्त्रः

—विष्णुपरकः

द्र० व्रतप्रकरणम्

वर्णः

—वर्णसृष्टिः ( ब्रह्मकृता )

३६।२१-२३

—वर्णधर्मः ( धर्माचरणमहिमा च )

१४।११६-१२१

व्रतम्

—तप्तकृच्छ्रम् ( व्रतविधानम् )

६२।१५-१७

—नक्षत्रपुरुषम् ( पुरुषवसा आचरितम्, नक्षत्रपुंस् पदम् ८०।३९,

८०।१-३९

भृगुणा पूर्वं कृतम् ८०।३० )

—विष्णुशिवसम्बन्धीनि व्रतानि ( चालुर्मास्यव्रत-द्वितीयाव्रत-

१६।१-१७।२५

कृष्णाष्टमी (= कालाष्टमी )-इत्यादीनि, देवशयनप्रसङ्गश्च )

—श्रवणद्वादशी ( भाद्रपदमासीया, प्रेतानुष्ठिता )

७६।५०-६०

शिष्यः

—शिष्यलक्षणम् ( नरकपापादिभिः सह )

६०।७५-६१।२९

सदाचारः

—अवध्यनिर्णयः ( इदं श्रुतिमतमित्युक्तम् )

५८।९२-९३

—प्रातर्मङ्गलम् ( सुप्रभातम् )

१४।२१-२८

—भक्ष्याभक्ष्यकथनम् ( विगर्हितान्नविषयकम् आश्रमधर्मान्तर्गतम् )

१४।८३-९४

स्तुतिः

द्र० सप्तमः खण्डः

स्वस्त्ययनम्

—स्कन्दार्थ ( हरिणानुष्ठितं कौश्ववधाय )

५८।१३-२५

षष्ठः खण्डः—कालः (कालावयव-युग-मन्वन्तर-कल्पाः)

मन्वन्तरम्

—मन्वन्तरीयमरुतुपतिः ( स्वायम्भुवस्वारोचिषोत्तमतामस-  
रैवतचाक्षुषमनुसम्बद्धा )

७२।१—७६

युगम्

—कलिः ( वलिराज्ये धर्मप्रायल्यात् कलिभयम्, कलेः

ब्रह्मसमीपागमनम्, विभीतकवनप्रवेशश्च )

७५।१—१३

## सप्तमः खण्डः—संवाद-स्तुति-नीति-गाथा-उपदेशादयः

### (१) विभागः—संवादः

— पुलस्त्य-नारदकृतः	११२-८
( वामनस्य वक्त्र-श्रोतारौ, पुलस्त्यं प्रति प्रदत्तः )	
—सनत्कुमार-पुलस्त्यकृतः	६०।६६-६१।७१
( ब्र० सनत्कुमार-ब्रह्म-संवादः )	
—सनत्कुमार-ब्रह्मकृतः	६०।६६-६१।७२
( योगादिविषयकः, सोयं पश्चात् सनत्कुमार- पुलस्त्य-संवाद रूपः )	
—सनत्कुमार-मार्कण्डेयकृतः	४३।४-४९।५१
( कुरुक्षेत्रमाहात्म्य-स्थाणुतीर्थ-पृथूदकसरो- विषयकः )	

### (२) विभागः—स्तुतिः

स्तुत्यः	स्तोता	
देवी [ शिवपत्नी रूषिणी ]	( अधोनिर्दिष्टानि देवीनामानि उपलक्षणया नेयानि, प्रदत्तं नाम तु पुराणप्रसिध्यनुसारेण )	
—गौरी	अन्धकः	७०।९० ( गद्य १ )
देवी [शिवपत्नीत्वं यत्र न स्पष्टं प्रतीयते]		
—कात्यायनी	देवाः	१८।१९-२०
”	देवाः	५६।५६-६३
नारायणः [ नराग्रजो विष्णुः ]		
”	ब्रह्मादः	८।४८—५५
वामनः		
”	ब्रह्मा	३०।१८-३१
”	ब्रह्मा	८६।३६-४१
विष्णुः		
”	अग्रस्त्यः	८८।१-२८ ( पापशमनस्तोत्रम् )
”	अदितिः	२७।१७-३६

विष्णु	अदिति:	७६।३३-३५
"	कश्यपः	२६।१
		( गद्यम्, अन्ते पद्यम् )
"	गजेन्द्रः	८५।३२-६०
		( गजेन्द्रमोक्षणस्तोत्रम् )
"	ग्रहादः	८।४८-५५
"	वलिः	६४।१२-१८
"	ब्रह्मादयः	२९।३६-४१
"	ब्रह्मा	९३।९
		( गद्यम् )
"	ब्राह्मणः	८६।६७-११०
		( सारस्वतं स्तोत्रम् )
"	शिवः	३।१४-२३
"	शिवः	८७।१-४८
		( पापप्रशमनस्तोत्रम् )
शिवः	अन्धकः	७०।५०-६४
"	दमयन्ती	६५।१२०
		( गद्यम् )
"	देवाः	४४।३८
		( गद्यम् )
"	ब्रह्माहरिश्च	६।७८-८०
"	ब्रह्मा	४४।५-८
"	ब्रह्मा	४६।११-१८
"	मङ्गणकः	३८।१७-१९
"	वेनः	४७।६२-१६२
"	शुक्रः	६६।२८-३१
"	शुक्रः	६६।३९-४०
"	मार्कण्डेयः	३२।६-२२
सरस्वती ( नदी )		
सूर्यः	अदितिः	७६।३३-३५

## (३) विभागः—मङ्गलाचरणम्

वामनपरकम् ( पुराणारम्भे )

१।१

,, ( पुराणसमाप्तौ )

६५।८९

## (४) विभागः—उपदेश-नीती

असितकृतः	६६।२८—३९
( प्रह्लादाय ; धर्माचरणविषयकः )	
प्रह्लादकृतः	७४।३५—५०
( बलये ; धर्माचरणविषयकः )	
प्रह्लादकृतः	६४।२३—७६
( बलये ; हरिभक्तिविषयकः भगवच्चरणागतिविषयकश्च )	
प्रह्लादकृतः	६५।१—६८
( बलये ; हरिपूजादानादिविषयकः )	

## (५) विभागः—गाथा

पितृगाथा ( हरिभक्तिविषयिका )	६५।४८—५३
------------------------------	----------

## अष्टमः खण्डः—वंश-वंशानुचरिते

नात्र वंश-वंशानुचरिते

## नवमः खण्डः—चरितम्

## विभागः—जातिः [ जातिसंबद्धानि गुणकर्मादीनि ]

ऋषिः	
—आर्षधर्मः	११।२२
किम्पुरुषः	
—एतद्धर्मः	११।२०
गन्धर्वः	
—एतद्धर्मः	११।१८
गुह्यकः	
—एतद्धर्मः	११।२५
देवः	
—देववाहनम्	६।१४—२३
—देवादिशयनविधिः	१६।५—१७

—देवोद्यानम् (= देवप्रियवृक्षः)

१७।१-१०

—देवधर्मः

११।१५

## देवासुरयुद्धम्

१ द्र० अन्धकः

६।१—१०।५७

२ द्र० अन्धकः

५९।१५—७०।९४

३ द्र० बलिः

२३।२—२१

४ द्र० बलिः

७३।१—७४।५०

५ द्र० सुरः

६०।२५—६१।७७

## दैत्यः

—दैत्यवाहनम्

९।२४—३०

—दैत्यधर्मः

११।१६

## पितरः

—पितृधर्मः

११।२१

## पिशाचः

—एतद्धर्मः

११।२७

## पुलिन्दः

—उत्पत्तिः

६७।१९—२६

## मानवः

—एतद्धर्मः

११।२३—२४

## राक्षसः

—एतद्धर्मः

११।२६

## विद्याधरः

—एतद्धर्मः

११।१९

## सिद्धः

—एतद्धर्मः

११।१७

### विभागः—व्यक्तिः

अगस्त्यः [ ऋषिः ]

—अगस्त्येन विन्ध्यो नीचशृङ्गः कृतः

१८२२-३६

अग्निः [ देवः ]

—रम्भासुरं प्रति वरप्रदानम्

१७४३-५३

—तपसा काल्याः ( = उमायाः ) गौरीरूपत्वं, शिवगौरीरतिः,

अमिकर्तृकं शिवरेतःपानं, देवान् प्रति गौरीशायः

५४११-७८

—शिवरेतःपानकारिणाऽग्निना कुटिलायां रेतसः प्रक्षेपः, शरवणे

कुमारजन्म, कुटिलाभिनिवादः, कार्तिकेयनामानि, अग्नेर्हिरण्यरेतस्त्वम्

५७११-४६

अग्निवेश्यः [ विप्रः ]

—कोशकारपुत्रस्य निशाकरस्य पूर्वदिग्मन् जन्मनि द्वेतेगर्दभरूपेण

जन्म, अस्य अग्निवेश्यपत्न्या त्रिभत्या सह रत्यर्थं चेष्टा, मरणं च

६११२१-११४

अग्निष्वात्ताः [ पितरः ]

अग्निष्वात्तपितृकन्या मेना, हिमदन्तनादिवाहार्थं कुशक्षेत्रे देवानां

तपश्चरणं पितृवृत्त्यर्थं [ २११२३-४९१५९ कुशक्षेत्रमाहात्म्यम् ]

२१११-५०१३

अजिता [ गदापाणिनृप-फल्गुनी ]

—अनया सह व्याघ्ररूपिणो निशाकरस्य रत्यर्थं चेष्टा, व्याघ्रवधः,

निशाकरस्य जन्मान्तराणि

६११२१-११४

अञ्जनः [ गुह्यकः, दमयन्ती-पिता ] द्र० दमयन्ती

६३३८-६५११६८

अदितिः [ कश्यपपत्नी ]

—अदितिपश्चरणं, तद्गर्भे वामनजन्म

२४११-२८११६

—पलिकर्तृकेन्द्रपराजयः, इन्द्रमातुरदितेस्तपश्चरणं, तव पुत्रोऽहं

भविष्यामीति विष्णुकर्तृकमदितयं वरप्रदानम्

७६११-४९

अन्धकः [ दैत्यः, हिरण्याक्षपुत्रः ]

—प्रह्लादेनान्धको राज्येऽभिषिक्तः, देवान्धकयुद्धं, देवपराजयश्च

६११-१०१५७

—महिषानुरवधानन्तरं अन्धकस्य क्षोभः, शिवपत्नीं गौरीं भोक्तुं

प्रयासः, अन्धकं प्रति प्रह्लादोपदेशः, नन्दिनाणेश्वरादिभिः सह

अन्धकयुद्धं, अन्धकस्य पातालगमनं, प्रह्लादेन तत्र

अन्धकजन्मविवरणं कथितं, परस्त्रीकामनायाः वृक्षत्वं च,

अन्धकेन गौर्यानयनार्थं दूतः प्रेषितः, शिवगणैः राहान्धकस्य युद्धं, शिवतः भैरवप्रादुर्भावः, तेन भैरवेनान्धको निर्जितः, अन्धकस्य भृङ्गित्वम्

५६।१५-७०।९४

### अपराजिता [ देवी ]

—गौरवर्णप्राप्त्यर्थं कालीतपश्चरणं, अपराजितया तस्याः परिचरणं गौरीदेहमलेन गजाननोत्पत्तिश्च ; काली = पार्वती

५४।१-७८

### अरजा [ शुक्रदुहिता ]

—अनया सह दण्डकवृकः व्यभिचारकरणार्थं प्रयासः, शुक्रेण दण्डोऽभिषासः, अत्र बह्विनि आख्यायानि

६३।२०-६६।९८

### अरुन्धती

—शिवगौरीविवाहप्रसंगे शिवेनेयं हिमालयं प्रति ग्रहितः, शिवपार्वतीविवाहादि

५१।१-५३।६२

### अर्णोदरः [ शूद्रः कपालिकशास्त्रविद्वन्मन्त्रशिष्यः ]

—कालदमनादिशास्त्रप्रसङ्गेन सह, अत्र कालदमनपाठः साधुः

६।८६-९१

### अहिंसा [ धर्मभार्या ]

—सनत्कुमार-सनातन-सनक-सनन्दना अस्याः पुत्राः

६०।६८-६९

—हरि-कृष्ण-नर-नारायणजननी

६।१-२

### अ।पस्तम्बः

—कालदमनशास्त्रवित्, तस्य शिष्यः ऋषेश्वरः ; कपालिका-दिशास्त्रप्रसङ्गेन सह

६।८६-९१

### आसुरिः [ ऋषिः ]

—अस्मै सनत्कुमारेणासुनं दत्तं, मौनमहायोग उक्तश्च

६०।६८-७१

### इक्ष्वाकुः [ नृपः ]

—ऋतध्वजस्येक्ष्वाकुवृषसमीपागमनं, तत्पुत्रं शकुनिं जाबालिमुक्तये याचनं च; शकुनिकर्तृकं जाबालिवन्धनमोचनम्, कथान्तरैः सह

६३।३८-६५।१६८

### इन्द्रः [ देवः=महेन्द्रः ]

—नर-नारायण-तपोदर्शनेनेन्द्रस्य क्षेमः, तपोनाशार्थं रम्भाप्रेषणं, नारायणेनोर्वशी उत्पादिता, इन्द्राय दत्ता च

६।१-७।२१

—कुरुकर्तृकं भूमिकर्पणं, इन्द्रेणैतत्कार्यविषये कुरुः पृष्टः, कुरुकर्तृकं कुरुक्षेत्रनिर्माणम्

२२।१-३९

- कुशकर्तृकं कुशक्षेत्रनिर्माणं, तस्मै वरो दत्त इन्द्रेण ४११३-२१  
 —वलिपराजितेनेन्द्रेणादितये स्वस्थितिकथनम्, अदितिगर्भे वामन-  
 जन्म, वामनेनेन्द्राय राज्यं प्रदत्तं, वलेः सुतलस्थितिः २३११-३११७  
 —ब्रह्मप्ररोचनया इन्द्रेण स्थाणुतीर्थं पांशुनाऽपूरितम् ४५११-३१  
 —इन्द्रेण कौशिकी भगिनीरूपेण स्वीकृता ५४११-२८  
 —इन्द्रकर्तृकः नमुचिवधः, शुम्भनिशुम्भकर्तृकदेवपराजयः  
 देवीकर्तृकः शुम्भादिवधश्च ५५११-५६१७२  
 —मलयपर्वत इन्द्रेण पाक-पुर-वधः, ततः पाकशासन-पुरन्दरसंहौ  
 इन्द्रस्य ७१११-१७  
 —इन्द्रत्वप्राप्तये ऋतध्वजमुतानां तपश्चरणं, इन्द्रेण पूतनाप्सरः-  
 प्रेषणं च ७२१२४-४१

इन्द्रद्युम्नः [ नृपः ]

- इक्ष्वाकुव्राता, इक्ष्वाकुपुत्रशकुनिकर्तृकं ऋतध्वजमुतजावालिवन्धन-  
 मोचनम्, इन्द्रद्युम्नजावाल्यादीनां सप्तगोदावरगमनं इन्द्रद्युम्नेन सह  
 वेदवतीविवाहश्च ६३१३८-६५११६८

उपमन्युः [ विप्रः ]

- श्रीतमन्युपुत्रः, मात्राऽग्नेय्या कृत्रिमदुग्धेतार्यं पालितः, शिव-  
 पूजया दुग्धलाभ इति मात्रामिहितं, श्रीदामासुरकथा च ८२११-४८

उर्वशी [ अप्सराः ]

- नारायणात् जन्म ७११-२१

उल्लखलमेखला [ यक्षी ]

- कपिलयक्षपत्नी, अनया युगन्धरेत्यादिश्लोक उदीर्यते ३४१४५-१०

ऋतध्वजः [ नृपः, = कुबलयाध्वः ]

- रिपुजितपुत्रः, एतत्कर्तृकः पातालकैतुवधः, विश्वावसुकन्यामदालस-  
 तध्वजविवाहश्च ५६११-१४

ऋतध्वजः [ मुनिः ]

- जाथालिपिता, जावालिन सह देववत्या विवाहः, कथान्तरैः सह ६३१३८-६५११६  
 —सप्तानामृतध्वजमुतानामिन्द्रत्वप्राप्तये महामेरी तपश्चरणं, भीतेन  
 इन्द्रेण पूतनाप्सरःप्रेषणं, पूतनादर्शनेन एतेषां शुक्रखलनं,  
 शङ्खिनीकर्तृकं शुक्रपानं, ततश्च सप्तमवतां जन्म ७२१२४-४१



कन्दरमाली [ दैत्यः ]

—देववतीपिता, कपिरूपविश्वकर्मणा देववत्यपहरणं,  
देववत्या सह जाबालिपरिणयः, कथान्तरैः सह

६३।३८-६५।१६८

कपिलः [ ऋषिः ]

—सनतकुमारेणास्मै आसनं दत्तं, मौनमहायोग उक्तश्च

६०।६८-७१

करम्मः [ असुरः ]

—रम्भभ्राता, पुत्रार्थं तपश्चरणं, इन्द्रकनूक-  
करम्भवधः, रम्भपुत्रमहिषजन्म च ।

१७।४३-६१

कलिः

—अलिकृतधर्मराज्ये कलिभयं, विभीतकवने  
उत्तप्रवेशश्च

७५।१-१३

कश्यपः [ तृतीयः प्रजापतिः २४।२२ ]

—दैत्यपराजितदेवमुक्त्यर्थं कश्यपपत्न्यदिति-  
गर्भे वामनजन्म

२४।१-२८।१६

—कश्यपपत्नीद्वज्रतः शुम्भ-निशुम्भ-नमुचिजन्म

५५।१-२

—कश्यपपत्नीदितितः मरुदुत्पत्तिः

७१।१८-४२

कामः [ देवः, =कन्दर्पः, मदनः ]

—शिवकनूकं कामदहनम्, तस्यानङ्गनामकारणम्

६।२३-१०७

कालनेमिः

—बलिपक्षीयसेनानीः, देवासुररणे हतः

७३।१-५४

कुजम्भः [ असुरः ]

—धन्वकयुद्धे विष्णुकनूकवधः

६७।१-७०।१४

कुटिला

—हिमवत्कन्या, कुटिला ब्रह्मशापेन नदीरूपाऽभवत्

५१।१-१६

—अग्निना शिवरेतसः प्रक्षेपः कुटिलार्था कृतः

कुमारजन्मादि,

५७।१-४६

कुवल्याधः [ नृपः ]

—अयमृतध्वजः ५६।११,

एतन्नामकाश्वयोगादिवं नाम, इ० ऋतध्वजः

५६।१-१४

कुमारः [ देवः, शिवपुत्रः ]

—शंकरसुतः स्कन्दः शुम्भहन्ता भविष्यतीति शुम्भनिर्णितान् देवान् प्रति विष्णुक्तिः [अत्र शुम्भपदं मुद्गणप्रमादजातं, नहि स्कन्दकर्तृकशुम्भवधो दृश्यतेऽत्र पुराणे, बहुषु कोशेषु 'शुम्भ' च] इत्यत्र महिषम् [२१।२०] इति पठ्यते, तदेव सम्यक् ]

२१।९-२२

—शिवशुक्रपानमग्निना, कुटिलया शुक्रग्रहणं, शरवणे कुमारजन्म, कृत्तिकाभिस्तस्य पालनं, तस्य देवसैनापत्येऽभिषेकः, तेन कौश्लमहिषतारकादीनां वधः ।

५७।१-५८।१२१

कुम्भः [ दैत्यः ]

—स्कन्दकर्तृकः महिषादिभिः सहास्य वधः

५७।१-५८।१२१

कुरुः [ नृपः ]

—संवरण-तपती-पुत्रः, कुरुक्षेत्रनिर्माता

२२।१-३९

—कुरुकर्तृकं कुरुक्षेत्रनिर्माणं, इन्द्रकर्तृकं वरप्रदानम्

४१।१३-२१

कृत्तिकाः [ षट् ]

—शरवणे कुमारजन्म, कृत्तिकाभिस्तस्य पालनं कृत्तिकाहेतुकं कार्तिकेयनाम, कुमारकर्तृकस्तारकादिवधः

५७।१-५८।१२१

कृष्णः

—अहिंसाधर्मपुत्रः, योगी

६।१-२

कोशकारः

—सुदगलमुनिपुत्रः, अस्य पत्नी धर्मिष्ठा, तस्या जडाकृतिः पुत्रः, राक्षस्या पुत्रस्यापहरणं प्रत्यावर्तनं च, कोशकारेणास्य निशाकरेतिनाम प्रदत्तं, निशाकरेण रवजडत्वकारणप्रदर्शनाय पूर्वजन्मवृत्तान्तवर्णनं तत्पर्यर्थं तस्य वदरिकाश्रमगगनं च

६१।२१-११४

कौशिकी [ देवी ]

—कालीकोशतो जन्म, इन्द्रेण्यं भगिनीरूपेण स्वीकृता,

५४।१-२८

[ ३० ५५।१-५६।७२ अपि शुम्भचण्डमुण्डादिवधप्रसङ्गः ]

काथेश्वरः

—कालदमनशास्त्राचार्यः, आपस्तम्बशिष्यः, शैवशास्त्रनामादिभिः सह;

[ अत्र कालवदनेति पाठः साधुः ]

६।८६-९१

क्रौञ्चः [ पर्वतः ]

—मिथ्याभाषिणोऽस्य स्कन्दकर्तृकं भेदनं महिषादिवधश्च,

५७।१-५८।१२१

क्षत्रियः [ नास्ति नाम ]

—द्विजद्रोहिणोऽस्य मरणानन्तरं राक्षसरूपं, सारस्वतस्तोत्रजपेन  
चास्य विष्णुलोकगमनम्

८६।१-१२१

गजेन्द्रः [ हस्ती ]

—विष्णुकर्तृकं गजेन्द्रमोक्षणं, गजेन्द्रमोक्षणस्तोत्रं च

८५।१-८४

गणः [ शिवगणः, गणनायकाश्च ]

—गणैः गणनायकैश्च सह अन्धकस्य युद्धम्

६७।१-६८।६५

गणेशः [ गजाननः ]

—पार्वतीमलात् जन्म, अस्य विनायकगजानननामनी, घटोदर-  
सहायवान्, कौशिकीचरितं च

५४।१-७८

गतिभासः [ विप्रः ]

—नेत्राभासकनिष्ठभ्राता, धुन्धुविजेता वामन आत्मानं  
गतिभासरूपेण कथितवान्

७८।१०-८९

गन्धमादनः [ पर्वतः ]

—शिवगौरीविवाहे सप्तर्षीणां हिमालयगृहे आगमनम्,  
गन्धमादनकर्तृकस्तेषां सत्कारः शिवगौरीविवाहश्च

५१।१-५३।६२

गदापाणिः [ नृपः ]

—अनेन व्याघ्ररूपी निशाकरः पिञ्जरे स्थापितः, नृपपत्न्या सह व्याघ्रस्य  
रस्यथं चेष्टा, तस्य वधश्च, निशाकरस्य जन्मान्तराणि

९१।२१-११४

गालवः

—गालवतपोविप्रकारिणः पातालकेतोः ऋतध्वजकनुरो वधः

५९।१-१४

गोपायनः [ ब्राह्मणः ]

—शैवशास्त्रवित्, शक्तिशिष्यः, कपालिकादिशास्त्रप्रसङ्गश्च

६।८६-९१

गोमाता

—मलयस्थानसुरनाशाय शिवेनेन्द्रः प्रेषितः, मार्गे इन्द्रो गोमातरमपश्यत् ७१।१-१७

घटोदरः [ देवः ]

—देवीकर्तृक-गजाननसृष्टिः, गजाननसहायको घटोदरः

५४।५६-७८

घृताची [ अप्सराः ]

—कपिरूपिष्वकर्मणा घृताचीकन्याया वेदवत्या अपहरणं,

विश्वकर्मणा घृताचीगर्भे नलनामकपुत्रोत्पादनम्, कथान्तरैः सह ६३।३८-६५।१६८

चण्डः [ दैत्यः ]

—महिषपक्षीयः, देवीकनूको वधः महिषादिभिः सह

१९११-२०१५१

—महिषास्यः, देवीकनूको वधः शुम्भादिभिः सह

५५११-५६१७२

चन्द्रावली [ वणिक्-पुत्री ]

—कोशकारस्य जडमति-पुत्रेण स्वपूर्वजन्मवृत्तान्तवर्णनं, एकस्मिन्  
जन्मनि तस्य कस्यचिद्वणिजो गृहे शुकरूपेणावस्थानं, चन्द्रावल्या सह

रत्नार्थं प्रयासः, शुक्रस्यमरणं च

९११२१-१११४

चिक्षुरः [ महिषसैन्यपालः ]

—देवीकनूको वधः महिषादिभिः सह

२०११-५१

चर्चिका [ देवी ]

—शिवललाटतो जन्म, चर्चिकानामकारणम्

७०१३९-४५

चित्राङ्गदा

—विश्वकर्मकन्या, अनया सुरथायात्मदानं कृतं, विश्वकर्मणास्यै शापो

दत्तः, हाटकेश्वरे सुरथेन सह अस्या विवाहश्च, कथान्तरैः सह

६३१३८-६५११६८

च्यवनः [ ऋषिः ]

—अस्य रसातलगमनं, तत्र प्रह्लादेन सह संवादः,

अनेन नैमिषतीर्थप्रशंसनं, प्रह्लादस्य नैमिषगमनोद्यमः

७१२२-३९

जयन्ती [ देवी, पार्वती-सखी ]

—तपश्चरणकाले पार्वती सेविताऽनया

५४११-७८

जयश्रीः [ =लक्ष्मीः द्र० ]

७५११४-५२

जया [ देवी ]

—गौरवर्णप्राप्तये कालीतपश्चरणं, जयादिभिः तस्याः परिचरणम्,

देवीदेहमलतः गजाननोत्पत्तिश्च

५४११-७८

जलोद्भवः [ असुरः ]

—ब्रह्मवरलाभानन्तरं सर्वतापकारी, विष्णुशिवकनूको वधः

८१११८-३३

जाबालिः [ ऋषिः ]

—ऋतन्वजर्विपुत्रः, कपिरूपि-विश्वकर्मणास्यापहरणं, देववत्या सहास्य

परिणयः, कथान्तरैः सह

६३१३८-६५११६८

जम्भः [ असुरः ]

—अन्धकमुहः, हन्त्रकनूकवधः

६७११-७०११४

## ज्योतिष्मान् [ नृपः ]

—वपुष्मतः पुत्रः, पत्न्या सुश्रोण्या सह पुत्रार्थं तपश्चरणं, सप्तर्षिभिरस्यै  
पुत्रलाभाय वरो दत्तः, ततश्च सप्तमरुदुत्पत्तिः ७२।४२-५५

## तपतो

—संघरणपत्नी, कुरुजन्म २१।२७-२२।३

## तारकः [ असुरः ]

—स्कन्दकनूको वधो महिषादिभिः सह ५७।१-५८।१२१

## तुषिता [ अप्सराः ? ], इ० मङ्गिः

७२।७०-७५

## दक्षः [ देवः ]

—शिवकनूको दक्षयज्ञनाशः २।७-५।६१

## दण्डः [ नृपः ]

—शुक्रकन्यया अरजया सह व्यभिचारकरणाय दण्डरूपस्य प्रयासः,  
दण्डं प्रति शुक्रस्य शापप्रदानम्, चित्राङ्गदा-वेदेवती-दमयन्ती-  
देववतीनां चरितैः सह ६३।१९-६६।१७

## दनुः [ कश्यपपत्नी ]

—दनुतः शुभनिशुम्भनमुचीनां जन्म ५५।१-२

## दन्तध्वजः [ नृपः ]

—तामसपुत्रः, पुत्रार्थं तपश्चरणं, अग्नावस्थिमज्जाशुक्रादिहवनं,  
ततश्च सप्तमरुदुत्पत्तिः ७२।५६-६२

## दमयन्ती

—अजनशुक्रकन्यया प्रम्लोचायाश्च कन्या, इश्वरकनूपुत्र-शकुनिना सह-  
स्या विवाहः, कथान्तरैः सह ६३।३८-६५।१६८

## दितिः [ कश्यपपत्नी ]

—दितिगर्भतो मरुतां जन्म, इन्द्रस्य गोत्रभिदूनामकरणं च ७१।१८-४२

## दिवाकरः [ शूर्पाक्षी-राक्षसीपुत्रः ], इ० कोशकारः

९१।२१-११४

## द्वन्द्वुभिः [ मयपुत्रः १९।२१ ]

—महिषपक्षीयः, दूतरूपेण कात्यायनीसमीपं गत्वा स्वस्वामिमत्  
कथनं, देवीकनूको महिषादीनां वधः १७।३९-२०।५१

## देववती

—कन्दरमालिदैत्यकन्या, ऋतध्वजपुत्रेण जावालिना सहासया

विवाहः, कथान्तरैः सह

६३।३८-६५।१६८

देवी [ शिवपत्नीरूपा ; प्रदत्तं नाम खलु पुराणप्रसिद्धयनुसारेण ]

—हरललितं वर्षाघरत्कालिकम्

१।११-२।६

—पित्रा दक्षेण देवी न निमन्त्रितेति कृत्वा तरया मरणम्, संबद्धविषयैः सह २।७-५।६१

—मेनाहिमवत्कन्या काली, शिवेन सह विवाहार्थं तपश्चरणं, शिवपार्वती  
विवाहश्च

५।११-५३।६२

—विवाहानन्तरं काल्याः गौरवर्णार्थं तपः, काल्याः कृष्णकोशतः कौशिकी-  
जन्म, गौरीशिवरतिः, अग्निना शिद्यशुक्लपानं, गौरीदेहमलतो  
विनायकजन्म

५४।१-७८

—गौरीप्राप्तयेऽन्धकप्रयासः, प्रह्लादेन तक्षिपेधकरणं, शिवेन सहान्धक-  
युद्धं, शिवकनू कान्धकपराजयः, अन्धकाय देव्या वरप्रदानम्  
अन्धकस्य भृङ्गिरूपत्वं च

५६।१५-७०।९४

—शिवपार्वतीपुत्रस्य कुमारस्य जन्म शरवणे, कुमारस्य नामानि

५७।१-४६

देवी [ शिवपत्नीत्वेन न प्रतिज्ञाता ; प्रदत्तं नाम खलु पुराणप्रसिद्धयनुसारेण ]

—कात्यायनीकनू कमहिपचण्डमुण्डादिवधः

१७।३९-२०।५१

—विन्ध्यवासिनीकनू कशुम्भानिशुम्भादिवधः [ २१।३-४ स्थले  
उमाकोशजाता कौशिकी = विन्ध्यवासिनी ]

५५।१-५६।७२

धनदः [ कुबेर इति प्रतिभाति ]

—कपालिकशास्त्राचार्यः, अर्णोदरोऽस्य शिष्यः, शैवशास्त्रादिप्रसङ्गेन सह

६।८६-९१

धर्मः

—अस्य भार्याऽर्हिता ; सनत्कुमार-सनातन-सनक-सनन्दनाश्च पुत्राः

६०।६८-६९

—हरि-कृष्ण-नर-नारायण-पिता

६।१-२

धर्मिष्ठा [ कोशकारपत्नी, ] ३० कोशकारः

६१।२१-११४

धुन्धुः [ दैत्यः ]

—वामनावतारेण धुन्धुः पराभूतः, शुक्रोऽस्यापि पुरोहितः, अयं

वामनः प्रसिद्धाद् वामनात् प्राग् वभूव

७८।१०-८९

धूम्रलोचनः [ दैत्यः, = धूम्राक्षः ]

—शुम्भपक्षीयः, देव्यानयनार्थं शुम्भेन प्रहितः, देव्यास्य भस्मी-  
करणं, देवीकर्तृकः शुम्भादिवधश्च

५५।१-५६।७२

## धृतराष्ट्रः [ नृपः ]

—धृतराष्ट्रराज्यनाशार्थं वककतृ<sup>१</sup>को यज्ञः, राज्ञा वकः प्रसादितश्च ३६।२४-३५

## नन्दी [ शिवानुचरः ]

—अन्धकनन्दियुद्धं, नन्दपतनम्, देव्यान्धकः पराजितश्च ५६।१५-४७

## नमरः [ असुरः ]

—महिषपक्षीयः, सरसि महिषस्य पतनं, तेनास्य मृत्युः, महिष-  
कतृ<sup>१</sup>कदेवपराजयश्च १७।३८-७३

—महिषपक्षीयः, देवीकतृकोऽस्य वधो महिषादिभिः सह १७।३९-२०।५१

## नसुचिः [ दैत्यः ]

—कश्यपदनुपुत्रः, इन्द्रकतृ<sup>१</sup>कोऽस्य वधः, ५५।१-१०

## नरः [ अहिंसाधर्मपुत्रः, ] इ० नारायणः

६।१-७।२१ }  
७।२२-८।७२ }

## नरसिंहः

—शरमेण सहास्य युद्धम्, अस्यजन्मतीर्थप्रसङ्गतः ३६।२८-४०

## नारदः [ ऋषिः ]

—शारभ-नरसिंहयुद्धे नारदेन उभौ स्तुतौ ३६।२८-४०

—नारदेन पृथुनृपाय तत्पितृवेनविषयकः संवादः प्रदत्तः ४७।१-४८।३५

## नारायणः

—शिव-ब्रह्मविवादः, शिवकतृ<sup>१</sup>कब्रह्मशिरश्छेदनं, शिवस्य बदरिकागमनं  
तत्र नारायणं प्रति भिक्षार्थं प्रार्थना, नारायणबाहुतो नरजन्म, तेन सह  
ब्रह्मजातपुरुषस्य युद्धम् २।२०-५६

—अहिंसाधर्मपुत्रः, अस्य तपसेन्द्रस्यक्षोभः, तपोनाशाय रम्भाप्रेषणं च  
नारायणादुर्वशीजन्म, इन्द्रायोर्वशी प्रदत्ता नारायणेन ६।१-७।२१

—नराप्रजः ८।२८; प्रह्लादस्य नैमिषतीर्थयागसर्जनं, नर-नारायणाभ्यां  
सह युद्धं, नारायणकतृ<sup>१</sup>कं वर-प्रदानम् ७।२२-८।७२

## निकुम्भः [ दैत्यः ]

—स्कन्दकतृ<sup>१</sup>को महिषादिभिः सहास्य वधः ५५।१-५८।१२१

## निशाकरः [ कोशकारद्विजपुत्रः ]

—अयं जडमतिः, अनेन स्वपूर्वजन्मगतानि चरितानि कथितानि ९१।२१-११४

निशुम्भः [ दैत्यः ]

—शुम्भप्राता, देवीकतृ<sup>१</sup>कोऽस्य वधः

५५।१-५६।७२

नेत्राभासः [ विप्रः ]

—प्रभासविप्रज्येष्ठपुत्रः, पितृघनविभागार्थं भ्रात्रा गतिभासेन सहास्य  
विवादः, अनेन गतिभासो जले निक्षिप्तः

७८।१०-८१

पञ्चशिखः [ ऋषिः ]

—अस्मै धर्मपुत्रेण सनत्कुमारेणासनं प्रदत्तं मौनमहायोगोपदेशश्च

६०।६८-७१

पर्जन्यः [ गुह्यकः ], इ० वेदवती

६३।२८-६५।१६८

पाकः [ दानवः ]

—इन्द्रकतृ<sup>१</sup>कपाकदानववधः

७१।१-१७

पाञ्चालिकः [ यक्षः, धनदपुत्रः ]

—शिवं प्रति कामदेवनिक्षिप्तानामस्त्राणां स्वीकरणम्, शिवप्रसादात्  
पाञ्चालिकैश्चानामप्राप्तिः, ततः सर्वैरयं पूजितः

६।२५-५६

पातालकेतुः [ दैत्यः ]

—गालवतपोविघ्नकारिणोऽस्य ऋतध्वजकतृ<sup>१</sup>को वधः, अनेन विश्वावसु-  
कन्यामदालसाया अपहरणं कृत्वा, कुबलयामनेन ( = ऋतध्वजेन ) अस्य  
वधश्च

५६।१-१४

—मन्त्रयन्त्रस्य महिषादिपु पातालकेतुरागतः, महिषादिवधाय  
देवोद्यमसंवादोऽनेन प्रदत्तः

५८।२५-४९

पितरः [ इ० अग्निपक्षाताः ]

२१।९-५०।१३

( २१।२४-४६।५१ कुरुक्षेत्रम् )

पुरः [ असुरः ]

—इन्द्रकतृ<sup>१</sup>कोऽस्य वधः, इन्द्रस्य पुरन्दरनाम च

७१।१-१७

पुरूरवाः [ नृपः ]

—एतत्कतृ<sup>१</sup>कनक्षत्रपुरुषप्रतानुष्ठानम्

[ इ० सधर्मा ७९।१०-८४ ]

८०।१-३९

पूतना [ अप्सराः ] इ० इन्द्रः

७२।२४-४१

पृथुः [ नृपः ]

—पृथुपितृवृन्दानन्दकस्य नाशः, पृथोर्जन्म राज्याभिषेकश्च,  
वेतचरितेन सह, स्थाणुतीर्थप्रसङ्गतः

४७।१-४८।३५



## प्रह्लादः [ दैत्यः ]

- चयवन्नप्रशंसितनैमिषतीर्थदर्शनार्थमस्यागमनं, तत्र नरनारायणाभ्यां  
सहास्य युद्धं, प्रह्लादाय नारायणेन वरो दत्तः ७।२२-८।७२
- प्रह्लादेनान्धको राज्येऽभिषिक्तः, अन्धककतृ कदेवपराजयः ६।१-१०।५७
- बलिबन्धनकारिणि वामने प्रादुर्भूते सति दैत्यतेजोहासः,  
एतद्विषये प्रह्लादं प्रति बलेः प्रश्नः, हरिविषये बलि-प्रह्लाद-  
विवादः, बलिना प्रह्लादः प्रसादितः २६।१-३०।११
- गौरौरूपसुरधमन्धकं प्रति प्रह्लादेन परस्त्रीकासनादोषकथनं,  
एतत्प्रसङ्गे दण्डचित्राङ्गदावेदवतीदेववती-चरितानि ५६।२४-६६।६४
- वामनजन्मानन्तरं प्रह्लादं प्रति विष्णुद्वेषिणो बलेः क्रोधः ततो  
बलिना प्रह्लादः प्रसादितः, प्रह्लादतीर्थयात्रारम्भः ७३।१-७७।५७
- प्रह्लादतीर्थयात्राविवरणं, तीर्थान्तर्गतकथाश्च ७८।१-८४।५०
- प्रह्लादकृतस्तोत्राणि, बलियज्ञः, वामनकतृबलिबन्धनं च, प्रह्लादेन  
विष्णुभक्तिविषयकोपदेशो बलये प्रदत्तः, कथान्तरैः सह ८५।१-९५।८४

## प्रेतः [ नाम नोक्तम् ] ३० सधर्मा

७६।१०-८४

## बकः [ मुनिः, दारुम्यः ]

- बकेन धृतराष्ट्रो नृपो दक्षिणार्थं याचितः राज्ञा प्रत्याख्यातेन बकेन  
तद्राज्यनाशार्थं यज्ञानुष्ठानं, ततो राज्ञा बकः प्रसादितः ३६।२४-३५

## बलिः [ दैत्यः, विरोचनपुत्रः ]

- बलिनेन्द्रः पराजितः, इन्द्रपितुः कश्यपस्य तपश्चरणं, तपःकारिणीमि-  
न्द्रमातरमदितिं प्रति विष्णुना वरो दत्तः, अदितिगर्भे विष्णो-  
र्वामनावतारः, ततो दैत्यतेजोहासः बलियज्ञे वामनस्य पदत्रययाचनं,  
सुतले बलिस्थितिश्च २३।१-३१।९७
- बलिकतृ को देवपराजयः, देवप्रार्थनया विष्णोर्वामनावतारः,  
प्रह्लाद-बलि-विवादः, बलिना प्रसादितस्य प्रह्लादस्य तीर्था-  
नुगमनम्, कुरुक्षेत्रे (८९।५२) बलियज्ञः, तत्र वामनागमनं,  
वामनकतृ कं बलिबन्धनं, बलेः सुतलवासः, प्रह्लादेन बलि  
प्रति विष्णुभक्तिविषयक उपदेशो दत्तः ७३।१-८५।८४

## बाणः [ बलिपुत्रः ९२।५१ ]

- वामनं प्रति बलिबन्धनं न कर्तुमस्य प्रार्थनम्, वामनकर्तृ कं  
बलिबन्धनं च

६२।१-६६

### बालखिल्याः [ ऋषयः ]

- दाखनस्थे बालखिल्याश्रमे नग्नशिवागमनम्, ऋषिपत्नीनां मोहः  
 ऋषीणांक्षोभः, तैः, शिवलिङ्गपातनं च, ततः शिवलिङ्ग-  
 स्थापनं, लिङ्गपूजनं च ४३१४७-४४१३९
- शिवपार्वतीविवाहे गौरीमुखदर्शनेन ब्रह्मरेतःस्खलनं, ततो  
 बालखिल्यजन्म ५३१५६-५९

### ब्रह्मपुत्रः

- शिवब्रह्मविवादः, शिवकर्तृकब्रह्मशिरश्छेदनं, ब्रह्मणः कस्यचित्  
 पुरुषस्य जन्म, बदरिकाश्रमेऽनेन सह नारायणबाहुजातपुरुषस्य युद्धम् २१२०-५९
- ब्रह्मा [ब्रह्मकर्तृकः सर्गस्तु सर्गप्रकरणे द्रष्टव्यः]  
 —शिवब्रह्मविवादः, शिवकर्तृकब्रह्मशिरश्छेदनं, ब्रह्महत्यापापक्षालनार्थं  
 कपालमोचनतीर्थे शिवागमनम् २१२०-३१५९
- कामाक्षपीडितस्य शिवस्य दाखनागमनं, ऋषिशापेन शिवलिङ्गपातनं  
 विष्णुब्रह्मभ्यां शिवार्चनम् ६१५८-९३
- ब्रह्मकर्तृक शिवसंबन्धचतुःशास्त्रनिर्माणम् ६१८६-९९
- महिषनिर्जितानां देवानां ब्रह्मसमीपागमनं, ब्रह्म-हृदि हरादीनां  
 तेजोभिः कादयायनीप्रादुर्भावः, देवीकर्तृको महिषादिवधश्च १७१३८-२०१५९
- वलिनिर्जितानां देवानां ब्रह्मसमीपागमनं, ब्रह्मणा  
 विष्ण्वत्तारार्थमुपायकथनं, अदितिगर्भतो वामनजन्म, वामनाय  
 ब्रह्मणाऽजिनप्रदानम् २३१९-३८१४४
- ब्रह्माज्ञयेन्द्रेण स्थाणुतीर्थस्य पांशुभिः पूरणम् कृतम् ४५१९-३९
- ब्रह्मणः स्वसुतागमनं, तत्पापक्षालनार्थं तपश्चरणं,  
 ब्रह्मणः शिवाराधनं च ४६१९-५९
- हिमवद्दुहितरं कुटिलां प्रति ब्रह्मणः शापः, तस्याः नदीरूपत्वं,  
 हिमवद्दहिता रागिण्यपि ब्रह्मशापेन सन्ध्यारागवती बभूव ५११९-२०
- शिवपार्वतीविवाहे पार्वतीमुखदर्शनेन ब्रह्मणः रेतःस्खलनं, ततो  
 बालखिल्यजन्म ५३१९-६३
- कालीं पार्वतीं प्रति गौरवर्षप्राप्तये ब्रह्मणो वरदानं,  
 शिवगौरीरतिर्गजाननजन्मादि च ५४१९-७५
- अभिना शिवशुक्रं कुटिलायै प्रदत्तम्, उदयगिरिस्थशरवणं गन्तुं  
 अग्रेपदेशः कुटिलायै, तत्र कुमारजन्म, कुमारजन्मसंवादो  
 ब्रह्मणामये प्रदत्तः ५७१९-५८१९२९

- ब्रह्मतः सनत्कुमारस्य योगविज्ञानलाभः, अनेन ब्रह्मपुत्रत्वं  
च स्वीकृतम्, संबद्धविषयैः सह ६०।६७-६१।७१
- बलिकृतधर्मराज्ये कलिभयं, कलेर्ब्रह्मसमीपागमनं विभीतकवने  
कलिप्रवेशश्च ७५।१-९
- भूणहत्याकारिण इन्द्रस्य कृते ब्रह्मणः प्रायश्चित्तोपदेशः, गयायां  
विष्ण्वाराधनेन इन्द्रस्य पापमोचनम् ७६।१-२३
- स्वायंभुवादिषण्मन्वन्तरेषु मरुतां जन्मानि, ब्रह्मकर्तृकमरुज्जामकरणम् ७२।१-७६
- हरिकर्तृकसर्वदेवमयरूपप्रदर्शनं ब्रह्मणे, ब्रह्माकृतविष्णुस्तुतिश्च ८३।१-१५

### भरद्वाजः [ पाशुपतशास्त्रवित् ]

- अस्य शिष्यः सोमकेश्वरः, शैवशास्त्रादिप्रसङ्गेन सह ६।८६-९१

### भृङ्गिरिटिः

- वेनः शिवप्रसादेन भृङ्गिरिटित्वमाप, वेनचरितं च ४७।१-४८।३५

### भैरवः

- शिवतो भैरवोत्पत्तिः, तन्नेत्रतेजसान्धको निर्बलो जातः, शिवकर्तृक-  
मन्त्रकाय वरप्रदानम् ७०।१-९४

### मङ्गणकः [ ऋषिः,=मङ्गणः ]

- नरनाप्सरसं दृष्ट्वाप्य रेतःखलनं, कलसस्थिताद्रेतसः सप्तमरुदुत्पत्तिः,  
हस्तस्थाशाकरसदर्शनान्मृत्युमस्य, तपसा शिवप्रसादनं च ३८।१-२३
- अस्य शिवदर्शनं, क्रुशक्षेत्रे शिवमूर्तिस्थापनं ब्रह्मलोकगमनं च ६२।४५-५७

### मङ्किः [ मुनिः ]

- सप्तसारस्वततीर्थे मङ्कितपश्वरणं, तुषिता-दर्शनेन मुनिरेतःखलनं,  
ततश्च सप्तमरुदुत्पत्तिः ७२।७०-७५

### मदनः [ देवः,=कामः ] इ० कामः

### मदालसा

- विश्वावसुगन्धर्वकन्या, पातालकैतुनास्या अपहरणम्, ऋतध्वजकर्तृकः  
पातालकैतुवधः, मदालसार्तध्वजपरिणयश्च ५६।१-१४

### मरुत् [ देवः ]

- दितिगर्भतो मरुतां जन्म ७१।१८-४२
- स्वायंभुवादिषण्मन्वन्तरेषु मरुतां जन्मानि ७२।१-७६

## महिषः [ असुरः ]

—पित्रा रम्भेण महिष्यां गर्भोपादनं, महिषस्य जन्म, देव्या सह

युद्धं, देवीकर्तृको वधः

१७।३९-२०।५१

—स्कन्दकर्तृको वधस्तारकादिभिः सह

५७।१-५८।१२१

## मातरः [ मातृगणः ]

—देवीकर्तृके शुम्भादिवधे मातृभिः सह असुरयुद्धम्

५५।१-५६।१

## मार्कण्डेयः [ ऋषिः ]

—लक्षवृक्षतः सरस्वत्युद्गमः लक्षस्थमार्कण्डेयकृता सरस्वतीस्तुतिः,

मार्कण्डेयेन सह सरस्वत्याः कुरुक्षेत्रप्रवेशः, कुरुक्षेत्रमाहात्म्यं च

३२।१-३३।११

## मालवटः [ यक्षः ]

—मालवटमाश्रित्य रम्भासुर-तपश्चरणं, रम्भायाग्निकर्तृकं वरप्रदानं,

रम्भपुत्रमहिषजन्म, मालवटादियक्षैः रम्भमहिषी चितायां स्थापिता

१७।४२-५

## मुण्डः [ दैत्यः ]

—महिषपक्षीयः, देवीकर्तृको वधो महिषादिभिः सह

१६।१-२०।५

## मुद्गलः [ मुनिः ]

—अजनगुणकन्या दमयन्ती राजमहिषी भविष्यतीति कथितमनेन,

इक्ष्वाकुपुत्रपुत्रशकुनिना सह दमयन्त्या विवाहः, कथान्तरैः सह

६३।३८-६५।१६

## मुरः [ असुरः ]

—कश्यपपुत्रः, विष्णुकर्तृको वधः, विष्णोर्मुंरारिसंज्ञा, सनतकुमार-

चरितादिभिः सह

६०।२५-६१।१

## मेना [ हिमवत्पत्नी, पितृकन्या ]

—पितृकन्यामेनागर्भजा कन्या शिवसुतं स्वर्गमे धारयिष्यतीति

विष्णुनाक्तं देवेभ्यः

२१।९-२

—देवैः पित्राराधनं, प्रसन्नैः पितृभिः स्वकन्या मेना हिमवते वत्ता,

मेना-हमवद्-विवाहः

५०।१-१

## रक्तबीजः [ दैत्यः ]

—अग्निमन्थतो जन्म, देवीकर्तृको वधो महिषादिभिः सह

१७।३८-२०।५

—शुम्भनिशुम्भादिभिः सहस्य वधः देवीकर्तृकः

५५।१-५६।५

## रघुः [ नृपः ]

—ब्रह्मवरं लब्ध्वा मुरः देवादीन् जितवान् तस्य पृथिव्यामागमनं यत्र

यज्ञकर्मव्याप्तौ रघुरासीत्, वसिष्ठवचनाद् धर्मराजविजयाय मुरो जगाम

६०।२५-४

## रम्मः [ असुरः, करम्भभ्राता ]

—पुत्रार्थमस्य तपश्चरणं, अस्मा अग्निकर्तृकं वरप्रदानं, महिष्यां  
रम्भेण गर्भोत्पादनं, महिषजन्मानन्तरं रम्ममृत्युः, रम्मपत्नीकर्तृकं  
चित्तारोहणम्

१७।४३-७३

## रम्मा [ अप्सराः ]

—नारायणतपोनाशयेन्द्रेण रम्माप्रेषणं, नारायणेर्नोर्वशुत्पादिता  
इन्द्राय दत्ता च

६।१-७।२१

## रहोदरः [ मुनिः ]

—औशनसतीर्थस्थः, दण्डकारण्यस्थरामेण राक्षसशिरः पातितम्, तच्च  
रहोदरग्रीवालङ्गनं, औशनसतीर्थगमनेन ग्रीवातो राक्षसशिरसः च्युतिः

३६।१-१४

## राक्षसः [ नाम नास्ति ]

—कस्यचित् क्षत्रियस्य दुष्टस्वभाववत्वात् राक्षसरूपप्राप्तिः, विष्णुस्तव-  
जपेन तस्य विष्णुलोकप्राप्तिः

८६।१-१२१

## रागिणी [ हिमवत्कन्या,=रागवती ]

—ब्रह्मशापतः सन्ध्यारागवती संजाता, कुटिलाचरितेन सह

५१।१-२०

## रामः [ नृपः ]

—दण्डकारण्ये रामकर्तितं राक्षसशिरः

रहोदरग्रीवायां लङ्गनं, औशनसतीर्था-

गमनेन ग्रीवातः शिरसः च्युतिश्च

३६।१-१४

—रावणनिगृहीतवेदवत्याः सीतारूपेण जन्म,

रामपत्नीसीताया राधणकर्तृकमपहरणं, रामकर्तृको

रावणवधः, वेदवतीतीर्थमाहात्म्यं च

३७।८-१३

## रामः [ परशुरामः ]

—रामकर्तृकं क्षत्रनाशपूर्वकं पितृतर्पणं, क्षत्रनाश-

जमितपापापनोदनार्थं पितृन् प्रति रामप्रार्थना,

रामपापमोचनं, रामहृदमाहात्म्यं च

३५।१-१५

## रावणः

—रावणावमानितायाः वेदवत्याः रामपत्नीसीता-

रूपेण जन्म, रावणकर्तृकं सीताहरणं, रामकर्तृको

रावणवधः, वेदवतीतीर्थमाहात्म्यं च

३७।८-१३

## रिपुजित [ नृपः ]

—ऋतध्वजेन रिपुजितपुत्रेण पातालकेसुवधः ५६११-१४

—रैवतपुत्रो रिपुजित् सूर्यराधनेन सुरतिनाम्नौ  
कन्यां प्राप्तवान्, सुरतिरग्नौ प्रविवेश पिटृहीना,  
अमितः सप्तसुतोत्पत्तिः, ते मरुतोऽभवन् ७२१६२-७०

## रुरुः [ दैत्यः ]

—देवीकर्तृको वधः शुम्भादिभिः सह ५५११-५६१७२

## लक्ष्मीः [ देवी ]

—देवपराजयकारिणि बलौ लक्ष्मी-प्रवेशः २३१२-२१

—त्रैलोक्यलक्ष्मीरूपिणी, अस्या बलिसमीपे  
आगमनं, अस्याः श्वेत-रक्त-पीत-नीलमयानि  
चत्वारि रूपाणि ब्रह्मेन्द्र-प्रजापति-दानवेषु स्थितानि,  
अस्याः सरस्वती-जयश्री-लक्ष्मी-प्रियदेवीति चत्वारि  
नामानि, जयश्रीरूपिण्या पलेः समीपे स्थितिः ७५११४-५२

## वपुष्मान् [ नृपः ]

—अस्य पुत्रो ज्योतिष्मान्, यस्य पुत्राः सप्त मरुतः ७२१४२-५५

## वसिष्ठः [ ऋषिः ]

—संवरणनृपपुरोहितः, तपतीदर्शनान्तरं संवरणस्य  
विवाहेच्छा, तपत्यर्थं सूर्यो वसिष्ठेन प्रार्थितः,  
संवरण-तपती-विवाहः, कुरुजन्म च २११२७-२२१३

—सुरदैत्यो रघुसमीपमागतः, 'धर्मराजविजयाय  
प्रयासः कर्तव्य' इति मुराय पुरोहितो  
वसिष्ठ उक्तवान् ६०१२५-४८

—वसिष्ठ-विश्वामित्रविवादः, वसिष्ठानयनार्थं  
सरस्वतीनदी विश्वामित्रेणोक्ता, ततः विश्वामित्रेण  
सरस्वती शप्ता, सा शोणितवद्वाऽभवत्, अरुणा-योगेन  
सरस्वतीशुद्धिः, वसिष्ठोद्वाहतीर्थप्रसंगश्च ४०११-४५

## वामनः [ अवतारः ]

—बलिकर्तृको देवपराजयः, बलिवन्धनार्थं  
विष्णोर्वामनरूपेण कुरुजागले जन्म  
अदितिगर्भे, वामनकर्तृकं बलिवन्धनं च २३११-३११५७

—प्रसिद्धाद् बलिबन्धनकर्तुं वर्मनात् प्राग्धयं

बभूव, अनेन धुन्युः पराजितः, अस्य

पितुर्नाम प्रभासः

७८१०-८९

—बलिप्रतापनाशार्थमदितिगर्भे विष्णोर्वर्मनरूपेण

जन्म, बलियज्ञे आगमनं, वामनकर्तृकं बलिबन्धनं

बलिं प्रति प्रह्लादोपदेशः सुतले बलिस्थितिश्च

७३११-८५१८४

### विजया [ देवी, पार्वतीसखी ]

—तपश्चरणकाले पार्वती अनयासेविता, गौरीदेहमलतो गजाननोत्पत्तिः ;

[पार्वती = काली]

५४११-७८

### विन्ध्यः [ पर्वतः ]

—अगस्त्येन विन्ध्यो नीचशङ्खाः कृतः

१८१२२-३६

### विन्ध्यावली [ बलिपत्नी ]

—बलियज्ञकर्मणि दीक्षिता. सुतले बलिना सह अवस्थानं च

८८११-८५१८४

### विमतिः [ अग्निवेश्य-ब्राह्मण-पत्नी ] इ० अग्निवेश्यः

८११२१-११४

### विरोचनः [ दैत्यः ]

—स्कन्दकनू कोऽस्य वधः महिषादिभिः सह

५७११-५८११२१

### विश्वकर्मा

—विश्वकर्मकन्यया चित्राङ्गदया सह सुदेवपुत्रस्य सुरथस्य द्युभि-

चरणं, कन्यां प्रति विश्वकर्मणः शापः, ऋतध्वजशापेन विश्वकर्मणः

कपिलपत्न्यं, घृताच्यां गर्भोत्पादनेन शापमोचनं, चित्राङ्गदासुरथ

विवाहः, कथान्तरैः सह

६३१३८-६५१६८

### विश्वामित्रः [ ऋषिः ] इ० वसिष्ठः

४०११-४५५

### विश्वामित्रः [ गन्धर्वः ]

—विश्वामित्रकन्याया मदालसायाः पातालकेतुकनूकमपहरणं, ऋतध्वजेन

पातालकेतुर्हृतः, ऋतध्वज-मदालसा-परिणयश्च

५८११-५४

### विष्णुः

—इ० शिवः

६१५८-९३

—महिषनिर्जितानां देवानां ब्रह्मसमीपागमनं, ब्रह्महरिहरादीनां

तेजोभिः कात्यायनीप्रादुर्भावः, देवीकनूको महिषादिवधश्च

१७१३८-२०१५१

—अग्निध्वात्तपितृपूजनार्थं देवान् प्रति उपदेशनं, (येन वृताः

पितरः स्वकन्यां मेनां हिमवते प्रयच्छेयुः )

२११९-२६

- कुरुक्षेत्रकर्पणकारिणे कुरवे विष्णुना वरो दत्तः २२।१-३९  
 —इ० वामनः २३।१-३१।१७  
 —नृसिंहरूपी ; शरभरूपिणा शिवेन सहास्य युद्धम्, अस्यजन्म-तीर्थ-  
 प्रसंगतः ३६।२८-४०  
 —इ० अन्धकः ५६।१५-७०।१४  
 —विष्णुकर्तृको मुरासुरवधः, विष्णोर्भुरारिसंज्ञा च ६०।२५-६१।७७  
 —इ० वामनः ७३।१-९५।८४  
 —वामनो धुन्धुपराजयकृत् ७८।१०-८९  
 —शूलबाहुरूपिणा विष्णुना जलोद्भवस्य वधः ८१।१८-३३  
 —श्रीदामासुरनाशार्थं शिवेन विष्णवे चक्रं प्रदत्तं, विष्णुकर्तृकश्रीदामवधः ८२।१-४८  
 —विष्णुकर्तृकं गजेन्द्रमोक्षणम्, गजेन्द्रमोक्षणस्तोत्रं च ८५।१-८४  
 —ब्रह्मणे विष्णुना सर्वदेवमयं रूपं दर्शितम्, वरप्रदानं च ८३।१-१५

वीतमन्युः [ द्विजः ] इ० उपमन्युः

—उपमन्युपिता ८२।१-४८

वीरभद्रः

—अयं गणाधिपः शिवकर्तृकदक्षयज्ञानाशकर्मणि शिवसहायकः २।७-५।६१

वृषपर्वा [ असुरः ]

—यदा शुक्रः वृषपर्वगृहेऽतिष्ठत् तदा दण्डोऽरजासमीपमागतवान् ६३।२०-२३

वेदवती [ पर्जन्यगन्धर्वघृताचीकन्या ]

—कपिलपिविश्वकर्मणयं सागरे निक्षिप्ता, ततो ह्यटकेश्वर अस्या  
 आगमनं, तत्र इन्द्रधुम्न-वेदवती विवाहः, कथान्तरैः सह ६३।३८-६५।१६८

—रावणनिगृहीतवेदवत्याः सीतारूपेण जन्म, रावणकर्तृक  
 सीताहरणं, रामकर्तृकरावणवधश्च ३७।८-१२

वेनः [ नृपः ]

—स्थाणुतीर्थप्रसङ्गे वेनचरितं, ऋषिकर्तृकवेदनिन्दकवेनवधः  
 पृथोर्जन्म राज्याभिषेकश्च; वेनस्य म्लेच्छरूपता वेनस्वरूपं  
 नारदेन पृथगे उक्तं, नारदोपदेशेन पृथुना स्थाणुतीर्थे वेनानयनं,  
 शिवकर्तृकवरदानं वेनाय, वेनस्य भृङ्गिरिटिरूपत्वम् ४७।१-४८।३५

बोद्धुः [ ऋषिः ]

—अस्मै सनत्कुमारकर्तृकमासनप्रदानं मौनमहायोगोपदेशश्च ६०।६७-७१



## शकुनिः [ इक्ष्वाकुपुत्रः ]

—अनेन जाबालेः बन्धनमपाकृतं, जाबालिना सह कन्दरमालि-  
कन्याया देववत्या विवाहः कथान्तरैः सह

६३३३-६५१६८

## शक्तिः [ शैवशास्त्राचार्यः ]

—अस्य शिष्यो गोपायनः, पाशुपतादिशास्त्रप्रसङ्गेन सह

६१८६-९१

## शिवः

—हरललितं वर्षाशरत्कालिकम्

११०-२१६

—शिवकतृ कदक्षयज्ञनाशः, संवद्धविषयैः सह

२१७-५१६१

—शिवस्य कपालित्वं तत्कारणं च

२१९-३१५१

—कामाक्ष्यपीडितस्य शिवस्य दाखने आगमनं, ऋषिशापेन

शिवलिङ्गपतनं, विष्णुब्रह्मभ्यां शिवार्चनम्

६५८-९३

—शिवकतृ कं कामदहनं, कामस्यानङ्गसंज्ञा च

६१२३-१०७

—शिवं प्रति कामप्रयुक्तानामस्त्राणां पाश्चालिक्यक्षेण धारणं

तस्मै शिवस्य वरप्रदानं च

६१२५-५६

—शिवेन सुकेशये आकाशचारि-पुरदानं तत्पुरस्य पातनं सूर्येण,

सूर्यं प्रति शिवस्य क्रोधः, वाराणस्यां सूर्यपतनं च

१११-१५१६२

—शरभरूपिणा शिवेन सह नृसिंहस्य युद्धम्

३६१२-८-४०

—मङ्गलकणकेन शिवः प्रसादितः

३८११-२३

—नम्ररूपिणः शिवस्य दाखनागमनम्, ऋषिभिः शिवलिङ्गपातनं,

ऋषिदेवादिभिः लिङ्गस्थापनं, शिवपूजनं च कृतम्

४३१४४-४४१३९

—शिवकतृ कं स्थाणुतीर्थप्रशंसनं, ब्रह्मप्ररोचितेन हन्त्रेण पांशुभिरस्य-

तीर्थस्य पूरणं, शिवकतृ कं तीर्थ-वट-धारणं, वट-लिङ्गमाहात्म्यं च

४५११-३९

—स्वसुतागमनकारिणो ब्रह्मणः शिवाराधनम्

४६११-५१

—शिवप्राप्तये पार्वतीतपश्चरणं, शिवपार्वतीविवाहश्च

५१११-५३१६२

—शिवेन पार्वती कालीत्युक्ता, गौरवणार्थं पार्वतीतपश्चरणं, पार्वती-

देहमलतो गजाननजन्म

५४११-७८

—देवीकतृ के चण्डमुण्डादिवधे बृतरूपेण शिवस्य शुम्भसमीपागमनं,

शुम्भादिवधो देवीवर्तकः

५५११-५६१७२

—शिवपत्नीलाभायान्धकस्य प्रयासः, शिवगणैः शिवेन च सहान्ध-

कस्य युद्धम्, अन्धकपराजयः, शिवेनान्धकाय वरो दत्तः

५६१५-७०१९४

—३० शुकः

६२१४०-४४

—३० शुकः

६६११-४३

- शिवकर्तृक-सुदर्शनचक्रधारणकारणम् ८११५-३१  
 —शिवेन विष्णवे चक्रं प्रदत्तं, विष्णुना चक्रेण श्रीदामो हतः ८२११-४८

शुकः

- अन्धक-पुरोहितः ९१६ ; अन्धककर्तृक-देवपराजयः ६११-१०१५  
 —बलिपुरोहितः ३११३७ ; वामनाय दानं न कर्तव्यमिति बलिः  
 शुकं नोक्तः, दानार्थं बलेराग्रहः, वामनकर्तृकं बलिवन्धनम् २३११-३११५  
 —इ० मञ्जुणः ४२१४५-५५  
 —अन्धकयुद्धे शुककर्तृकं मृतदैत्योजीवनं, शिवेन शुकः स्वमुखे  
 प्रक्षिप्तः, शिवशिदनमार्गेण शुकस्य निर्गमनं, अतश्च शुकं तिनाम ६६११-४१  
 —सखीवनीविद्यालभार्थमोषवतीतीरे शुकस्य तपश्चरणं, शिववरेण  
 सखीवनीविद्यालभः ६२१४०-४४  
 —शुकसुताऽरजया सह दण्डस्य व्यभिचारकरणं, दण्डं प्रति शुकशापः  
 देववती-वेदवती-चित्राङ्गाचरितैः सह ६३११९-६६११  
 —धुन्धुपुरोहितः, वामनकर्तृकधुन्धुपराजयः ७८११०-८१  
 —बलिपुरोहितः, वामनाय दानं न कर्तव्यमिति बलये शुकं णोक्तम्,  
 वामनकर्तृकं बलिवन्धनम् ७३११-६५११

शुम्भः [ दैत्यः ]

- शुम्भबधविषयकः प्रश्नः, शिवस्य तपश्चरणं, शुम्भकर्तृकदेवपराजयः,  
 कुरुक्षेत्रे पितृपूजार्थं देवान् प्रति विष्णोरादेशः २१११-३१  
 —देवीकर्तृकः शुम्भबधः ५५११-५६११

शूर्पाक्षी [ राक्षसी ]

- कोशकारजङ्घपुत्रस्य अनयाऽपहरणं, स्वपुत्रं च कोशकारगृहे  
 रथापनं, कोशकार-पुत्रस्य स्वगृहे प्रत्यावर्तनम् ६११२१-११

श्रीदामा [ असुरः ]

- श्रीदामवधार्थं शिवो विष्णवे चक्रं दत्तवान्, विष्णुकर्तृकं चक्रशक्तिपरीक्षणं,  
 चक्रेण विष्णुना श्रीदामो हतः, वीतमन्युचरितं च ८२११-४

संवरणः [ नृपः ]

- तपस्या सह विवाहः, कुरोर्जन्म च २११२७-२३

सधर्मा [ वणिक् ]

- मद्रदेशीयशाकलनगरस्थः, सौराष्ट्रगमनकाले मरुभूमावस्य  
 धननाशः, प्रेतदर्शनं च । प्रेतेन स्वचरितमुक्तं, गयायां पिण्डदानार्थं

वणिक् प्ररोचितश्च । क्रमेण नक्षत्रपुरुषव्रताचरणेन वणिक्  
पुरूरवाः बभूव

७६।१०-८४

सनकः

—अहिंसाधर्मपुत्रः योगशास्त्रविचारकः

६०।६८-६९

सनत्कुमारः

—अहिंसाधर्मपुत्रः, ब्रह्मतोऽस्य योगविज्ञानलाभः, अनेन रवस्य  
ब्रह्मपुत्रत्वं स्वीकृतम्

६०।६७-६१।७१

सनन्दनः

—अहिंसाधर्मपुत्रः, योगशास्त्रविचारकः

६०।६८-६९

सनातनः

—अहिंसाधर्मपुत्रः, योगशास्त्रविचारकः

६०।६८-६९

सप्तर्षयः

—पार्वतीविवाहार्थं सप्तर्षीणां हिमालयगृहे आगमनम्

विवाहसंबन्धः स्थिरीकृतः

५२।१-६९

—ज्योतिष्मत्-पत्नीं सुश्रोणीं प्रति सप्तर्षिकर्तृकं वरप्रदानं,

सुश्रोणीचितातः सप्तमरुदुत्पत्तिः

७२।४२-५५

—सुरतिं प्रति सप्तर्षीणामनुरागः, सुरतेरभिप्रवेशस्ततो मरुतां जन्म

७२।६२-७०

सरस्वती [ नदी ]

—श्लक्ष्णवृक्षतः सरस्वत्युद्गमः, मार्कण्डेयेन सह अस्याः कुरुक्षेत्रे प्रवेशः,  
कुरुक्षेत्रमाहात्म्यं च

३२।१-३३।२१

सवनः [ नृपः ]

—प्रियव्रतपुत्रे सवने मृते तत् पत्न्याः सुवेदायाः पतिचिताया-  
मारोहणं, आकाशे परन्या सह रममाणस्य राज्ञः रेतःस्खलनं,  
सप्तभिः मुनिपत्नीभिः रेतसः पानं, ततः सप्तमरुतां जन्म

७२।४-२३

सीता [ रामपत्नी ] ३० वेदवती

३७।८-१२

सुकेशी [ सुकेशिरपि, राक्षसः ]

—विद्युत्केशिपुत्रः, अस्य पुरमाकाशात् सूर्येण पातितं, ब्रह्मणा  
पुनराकाशे स्थापितं च

११।१-१५।६२

सुग्रीवः [ दैत्यः ]

—दूतरूपेणायं देवीं प्रति शुम्भेन प्रेषितः, देवीवाक्यानि पुनरनेन  
शुम्भाय निवेदितानि, देवीकर्तृकः शुम्भादीनां वधः

५५।१-५६।७२

सुनाभः

—हिमवन्मेनापुत्रः

५११

सुरतिः [ रिपुबिन्नृप कन्या ] ३० रिपुजित्

७२१२-७०

सुरथः [ नृपः ]

—सुदेवतनयः, विश्वकर्मकन्याचित्राङ्गदया सह व्यभिचरणं  
वदरिकाश्रमे सुरथतपश्चरणं हाट्केश्वरे चित्राङ्गदा-सुरथ-  
परिणयः, कथान्तरेः सह

६३१३८-६५१९६

सुवेदा [ सवतनृप-पत्नी ] ३० सवनः

७२१४-२३

सुश्रोणी [ ज्योतिष्मन्नृपभार्या ] ३० ज्योतिष्मात्

७२१४२-५५

सूर्यः [ देवः ]

—वाराणस्यां लोलरूपेणावस्थानम्

३१४०

—सूर्येण सुकेशिपुरममाकाशाद् भूमौ पातितं, सूर्यं प्रति शिवस्य कोपः,

सूर्यस्य वाराणस्यां पतनं लोलनाम च

११११-१५१६२

—सूर्यकन्यया तपत्या सह संवरणस्य विवाहः

२११२७-२२१३

सोमप्रभा [ पार्वतीसखी ]

—पार्वतीतपश्चरणं, बद्धरूपि-शिवागमनं,  
पार्वतीं प्रति शिवप्रश्नाः, सोमप्रभाकृतकम्  
उत्तरदानं, शिवपार्वतीविवाहश्च

५१११-५३१६२

सोमकेश्वरः [ नृपः, पाशुपतशास्त्रवित् ]

—अयं भरद्वाजशिष्यः, शैबशास्त्रादिप्रसङ्गेन सह

६१८६-९१

सोमशर्मा [ विप्रः ]

—वणिजं सधर्मिणं प्रति प्रेतस्य सोमशर्म-  
रूपेण परिचयप्रदानं, अयं पापाचारकृत्,  
अनेन भाद्रपदश्रवणद्वादश्यां दानं कृतं, तद्दान-  
पुण्येनाद्यप्राप्तिः

७६१११-८४

सौदामनी [ कुरुनृपपत्नी ]

—कुरुणा सह विवाहः, कुरुकृतं कं कुरुक्षेत्रनिर्माणम्

२२११-२२१३९

स्कन्दः [ देवः, = कुमारः ] —३० कुमारः

हरिः

—अर्हिसाधर्मपुत्रः, योगी

६११-२

## हिमवान् [ पर्वतः ]

—असुरनिर्जितदेवान् प्रति 'पितृकन्यामेनाहिमवद्- विवाहाय उद्यमः कार्यः येन मेनाकन्यायां शिवपत्न्याम् असुरहन्तुर्जन्म स्यात्, अतः कुरुक्षेत्रे पितरः प्रसादनीयाः' इति विष्णुरुक्तवान्	२१।९-२२
—देवैः पित्राराधनं कृतं, पितृकन्यया मेनया सह हिमवतो विवाहः	५०।१-१३
—मेनागर्भतः काली-रागिणी-कुटिला-सुनाभानां जन्म, उमायास्तपस्वरणं, शिव-कालीविवाहश्च [ काली = पार्वती ]	५१।१-५३।६२

## दशमः खण्डः—निर्वचन-लक्षण-पदार्थगणनावर्णन-मतादयः

## ( १ ) विभागः—निर्वचनम्

आदित्यः	४३।३६
चामुण्डा	५५।८३
नारायणः	४३।३०
पुत्रः	४७।३१; ६०।७६
यमः	६०।५३
राजा	४७।२४
विनायकः	५४।७२-७३
शिष्यः	६०।७६

## ( २ ) विभागः—लक्षणम्

नग्नः	१४।९१
नृपः ( शरीराङ्गलक्षणम् )	२१।४९-५४

## ( ३ ) विभागः—पदार्थगणना

मरुत् ( सप्त )	३८।५-६
सरस्वती ( सप्त )	६२।५४

## ( ४ ) विभागः—वर्णनम्

कन्याशरीरम् ( कात्यायनीवर्णनम् )	१६।३-१६
त्रिकूटपर्वतः	८५।४-१८

देवासुरयुद्धम् ( रूपकालङ्कारमयम् )	६।३५-४०
वर्षाकालः	१।१५-२४
वसन्तर्तुः	६।९-२१
वामनः ( वामनविराड् रूपम् )	३१।५२-७०
वाराणसी ( अत्र परिसंख्यालंकारोऽप्यस्ति )	३।३०-४०
शरत्कालः	२।१-४
सभा ( ब्रह्मणः )	२४।१९-२५

### ( ५ ) विभागः—आचार्यमतानि

आसितमतम् ( धर्मव्यवस्थापनसंबन्धि )	६६।२८-३९
गाधिऋलोकः ( कर्तव्याकर्तव्यविषयकः )	५६।२८-२९
भृगुमतम् ( सचैलस्नानपरम् )	१४।९६
मनुमतम् ( भक्ष्यविषयकम् )	१४।६०

### ( ६ ) विभागः—विविधम्

जातिश्रैष्ठ्यनिर्णयः	१२।४४-५६
पुष्पधनुः ( चम्पक-वकुल-पाटल-जाती-मल्ली-मयम् )	६।९७-१०२
वृक्षाः ( देवप्रियाः )	१७।१-१०
सुदर्शनचक्रस्वरूपम्	८२।२३-२९
सुप्रभातम् ( प्रातर्मङ्गलम् )	१४।२१-२८

## VEDA VYASA INSTITUTE OF PURANIC AND INDOLOGICAL RESEARCH

In course of Examination of various texts and Mss. connected with the Purāṇas, it has been found that the Puranic texts furnish an unrivalled documentation of the religious and social history of India covering a myriad facets of the evolving cultural movements of thought and action from the earliest times. This has thrown open before us a vast field for research which has hitherto remained unexplored.

The Board of Trustees of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, whose object is to promote the cause of Sanskrit-learning and Indian culture, have therefore decided to start a Research Institute under its Purāṇa Department, to be styled as **"Veda-Vyāsa Institute of Puranic and Indological Research"** to carry on extensive research on Puranic and allied texts.

The Institute will be affiliated to Indian Universities and will prepare students for Doctorate Degree. It is going to be registered shortly, and a Director will be appointed to guide the research work. His Highness the Mahara'ā of Banaras has kindly donated the historical Fort of Raja Chait Singh at Shivala with a spacious Compound, where it is proposed to build an Auditorium and also quarters for the scholars who would like to reside near the Institute.

It is expected that adequate financial aid will be forthcoming to carry out this work.

The work of critically editing the 18 Mahāpurāṇas is also in the hand of the Kashiraj Trust, the details of which appear elsewhere in this Volume.

RAMESH CHANDRA DE

*General Secretary,  
All-India Kashiraj Trust*

## BOOK-REVIEW

Hans Losch, *Rājadharmā, Einsetzung und Aufgabenkreis des Königs im Lichte des Purāṇa's* [Installation & Scope of Duty of the King in the light of the Purāṇa] (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, N. S., Vol. 8) Bonn (Orientalischen Seminar der Universität Bonn) 1959. 8°. XI, 397 pp.

This extremely able, complete, and yet modestly-written account of the treatment of the royal consecration and the king's duties as seen in *purāṇa*-literature comes as a most welcome addition to the as yet scanty publications from Europe on the *dharmaśāstra* during the twentieth century. The topic is appropriately chosen by the author of *Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa*<sup>1</sup>, fits neatly into the fields of study which Indian scholars and their European colleagues have been more recently exploiting, and serves to further researches in the realms of anthropology and legal history as well as mediæval Indian literary history.

The rehabilitations of *purāṇas* as trustworthy sources on the practice of knowledgeable caste-Hindus is going forward as critical and comparative studies of individual *purāṇas* appear.<sup>2</sup> The *purāṇas* as sources of law are beginning to attract attention.<sup>3</sup> The former disgust with which their texts used to be read is being succeeded by curiosity, if not admiration; as it is being more and more realised that in many of them we find propositions of law and practice which were not to be found

---

1. G. und P. Ein Beitrag zur Frage von des Entstehungsart der altindischen Rechtschriften und der Purāṇa (Potsdam, 1929) a sequel to Die Yājñavalkyasmṛti verglichen mit den Parallelen des Agni- und Garuḍapurāṇa (Bonn, 1927).

2. R. C. Hazra, studies in the Upapurāṇas I, (Calcutta, 1958) and several articles including "Studies in the genuine āgneya-purāṇa alias Vahnī-purāṇa", *Our Heritage*, i 1953, 209-45.

3. Bhabatosh Bhattacharya, "The Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa: its Dharmaśāstra contents and their utilisation in mediæval digests", *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, NS, XXVIII, 1, 1953, 6-18.



in the *dharmaśāstra* texts, or even in *arthaśāstra* in so many words, and yet served a useful purpose in the eyes of the real jurists of mediæval India, the compilers of *nibandhas*. such as Lakshmīdhara, and commentators such as Vijñāneśvara. The exact extent to which *purāṇas* served as legal authorities, and the reasons why they alone could supply what was needed in many crucial contexts, are yet to be made out. Until the *purāṇas* themselves have been critically studied and edited, and their rules compared with those of the classical and "genuine" sources, we can do little more than generalise hopefully. This work of *Losch*, however, supplies exactly what is needed at this particular juncture. The sections of the *purāṇa*-text in question (namely VDhP. II. 18-22 = A. P. 218-219 ; MP. 215-227 = VDhP. II. 24-72) have been re-edited in the style we recognise as that of Kiefel, the basis being the *Vishṇudharmottarapurāṇa* of the *Matsyapurāṇa* supported by the *Vishṇudharmottarapurāṇa* and the *Agnipurāṇa*. This critical text, with all variations noted, forms the basis of two further works : first the relationship of the text to the *Manusmṛiti*, the *Mahābhārata* and *Yajñavalkya* and occasionally other *smṛitis* is shown (a work much smaller in compass but by no means less significant than the next), and then the content is described and set out faithfully according to the concepts of the original compilers—a task which occupies about a half of this book.

The relationship between the various *purāṇa* texts is not easy to make out, nor their dates ; but L. has been able not only to explain the processes of copying and other forms of dependence, with the occasional major interpolation (pp. 14-17, 38-44 130-3), but also to arrive at a dating about the 6th-7th century A. D. for the *Matsyapurāṇa*, which agrees with the independent conclusions of M. Ghosh and others.

The relationships between the *Manusmṛiti* and the *Mahābhārata* on the one hand, and both of these with the *purāṇas* on the other has always been somewhat difficult to conjecture.

This study will, by isolating numerous occasions of obvious dependence, enable the work which the compilers of *purāṇas* were attempting to do to be more easily appreciated, and their aspirations vis-a-vis the existing canonical works to be apprehended. It seems evident from the additions to the existing works of reference, such as the list of "medicinal" herbs (p. 26), and the amendments and adjustments of rules already found in Manu, for example, (e.g. at p. 151, that the authors hoped to supply something more complete, practical, and up-to-date than the existing works; and indeed this process seems to have gone on without stop well into the 9th century, when we find the commentators taking over the task, and, somewhat surprisingly, assuming that these late compilations, many of which were corrupt in style and patently recent "forgeries", were of at least equal authoritativeness with the hoary *smṛitis* themselves. Our interest to find out just what the *purāṇa*-compilers thought was worth preserving from the existing material, and what they thought it advisable to supply from their own knowledge is satisfied by just such a work as L.'s. It is to be expected that studies emulating the object of this review may appear on smaller scales in this recently founded journal, which is devoted to precisely this field of study. L. himself emphasises (p. 37) the usefulness of the texts as historical documents.

Utilising this often laconic and corruptly-written material, in places, particularly in the *Agnipurāṇa*, grossly compressed, is difficult and painful work. We are indebted to L. for his painstaking analyses of the material and classification and identification of plants, poisons, etc., which the average reader of Sanskrit could hardly bother to consider, but for the work on which the anthropologist will certainly be very grateful to the author. The additional technical question of astrological data L. wisely leaves to a specialist in that field (p. 4). It is evident that by the 6th century the whole subject of the consecration of the king and his sphere of duty was surrounded with taboos and that the basic propositions of *dharma* and *artha-śāstra* no longer sufficed: these *purāṇa*-texts serve to put us

in a position to understand what the court-*purohitas* had to know in a period which is unquestionably historical. That all this was needful can be explained better by the historian, particularly the historian of cultural influences of pre-Āryan upon Aryan usages.

The *rājābhisheka* ("coronation", "anointing") occupies pp. 18 to 37. Particular attention is given to the *purāṇa* prescriptions concerning the choice of moment for consecration, the *purandara*—or *aindri-śānti*, predictions from the sacred fire, and the actual consecration ceremony. At pp. 33–7 we are given details of the *mantras* accompanying the installation. Appendices show in an exceptionally clear manner items which it would not be feasible to set out in the text.<sup>1</sup> By far the larger part of the discussion is devoted to the king's duties, *rājadharmā* in the narrower sense. If the collocation of topics would not suit modern western classification that is not the fault of L., but of his *purāṇic* author. The subdivisions of this section (i) acquisition of collaborators and servants ; (ii) relationship of his subordinates to the king ; (iii) construction of a fort and duties connected therewith ; (iv) means of warding off poisons and demons ; (v) means of protecting the king ; (vi) education and protection of the king's son ; relationship of the king to his environment (a euphemistic reference to royal tendencies to corruption) ; (vii) fate and human endeavour ; (viii) the seven instruments of policy, i. e. *sāmān*, *bheda*, *dāna*, *danḍa*, etc. ; (ix) the royal function as administrator of law (*kenigliche it ehtshoheit*) ; and (x) conclusion.

By far the weightiest and most detailed section is the ninth. We are curious to see into what detail the *purāṇa* goes with reference to *vivādapādas*, which one would have thought were adequately covered in the *smṛitis*. New lights are frequently cast upon that was then thought to be settled upon old controversies, which by no means ceased in the 7th century.

---

1. *Mantras* (pp. 176-191) ; *herbs* (pp. 192-223) ; and several detailed concordances.

For example the age-old problem of the *ātatāyin* (pp. 155-6). The ultimate dependence upon Manu, Yājñavalkya, and Nārada is readily admitted by L (p. 17+).

A great merit of the work is the refusal to be drawn into comparative theorisings, or to stray from the path of accurate description. Had every topic been submitted to theoretical explanation the bulk of the book would have been three times as great. Yet variant readings are constantly examined; misleading translations are pointed out (e. g.) that of Bühler on Manu VII, 48 at p. 92 n. 4); ambiguous expressions are happily settled (e. g. *śāmanā* at p. 166 n. 4—there is a misprint in the text at the place in question—is correctly given as Grenzhüter, “warden of the Marches”); the parallel with western notions very sparingly indicated (e. g. reference to Macchiavelli at p. 102 n. 3); and parallel texts from the *Hitopadeśa*, *Mānasollāsa*, *Yasustilaka*, and of course *nibandhas* brought in where relevant. It is a comfortable work, though, utterly unpretentious, and perfectly successful.

J. DUNCAN M. DERRET, LONDON.

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. III, No. 2]

व्यासपुर्णिमाऽङ्कः

[27 July, 1961

लेखसूची—Contents

	Pages
विष्णोरवतारः श्रीकृष्णद्वैपायनो व्यासः [Śrī Kṛṣṇa- Dvaipāyana Vyāsa as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu] (Compiled by Śrī Anand Swarup Gupta) The Genius of Vyāsa (Adapted from Śrī Aurobindo's <i>Vyāsa and Vālmīki</i> ) [व्यासस्य प्रतिभा— श्री अरविन्दरचितव्यास- विषयकनिबन्धात् संक्षिप्तम् ]	189—191
गजेन्द्रमोक्षणं नाम विष्णुस्तोत्रम् [The Viṣṇu-stotra called Gajendra mokṣaṇa] <i>Śrī Anand Swarup Gupta</i>	195—201
Kadrū, Vinata and the Wager [कद्रूः, विनता, तयोः पणं च] <i>Dr. Sadashiv A. Dange, M. A., Ph. D.;</i> Deshmukh Plots, Khamgaon (Maharashtra)	203—214
The Four World Oceans and the Dvīpa-Theory of the Middle Ages [चत्वारो महासागराः, मध्ययुगीनो द्वीपसिद्धान्तश्च] <i>Dr. B. H. Kapadia ; Prof, Sardar Vallabhbhai</i> Vidyāpeeth, Vallabhnagar (Gujarat)	215—221
सम्भवैतिह्यविचारः [The Problem of the <i>Sambhava</i> and <i>Āitiḥya</i> Pramāṇas] <i>Pt. Anant Shastri Phadake ; Prof., Sanskrit-</i> University, Varanasi	222—227
Similes in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa [विष्णुपुराणे प्रयुक्ता उपमाः] <i>Dr. V. Varadachari, M. A. Ph. D.;</i> Department of Sanskrit, Sri Venkatesvara University, Tirupati.	228—234

- कूर्मपुराणविषयाणां समालोचनम् [A Review of the Subjects  
dealt with in the Kūrma-Purāṇa] 235—252  
*M.M. Pt. Girīdhār Sharma Chaturvedi,*  
Dharmasaṅgha, Varanasi
- Studies in Purāṇic Geography and Ethnography—  
Śākadvīpa [पौराणिकमुवनकोशस्य पौराणिकजातीनां  
च विवेचने शाकद्वीपविचारः] 253—287  
*Dr. Buddha Prakash,* M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt.;  
Motibhavan, Saharanpur (U. P.)
- प्रह्लादचरितस्य श्रुतिमूलकत्वम् [The Śruti as the  
Source of the Prahlāda-carita] 288—295  
*M. M. Pt. Anant Krishna Shastri,*  
Hanuman Ghat, Varanasi.
- Obituary of Late Prof. B. Heimann —296  
The Philosophy of the "It" [तदित्याख्यस्य तत्त्वस्य विमर्शः] 297—308  
*Late Prof. Betty Heimann ;*  
109 Gloucester Terrace, London, W. 2
- प्राचीनग्रन्थेषु पुराणानामुल्लेखः [The References of the  
Purāṇas in the Ancient Sanskrit Works] 309—310  
(Compiled by *Sri Ram Shankar Bhattacharya*)
- Matsya-Purāṇa and Promiscuity [मत्स्यपुराणे अवैवाहिकमैथुन-  
निदर्शनानि !] 311—318  
*Prof. S. G. Kantawala,* M. A., Ph. D. ;  
M. S. University, Baroda
- रतिवृत्ता शिवस्तुतिः [The Praise of Śiva by Rati,  
the wife of Kāmadeva] 319—320  
(From Matsya Purāṇa, 154. 260-270)
- Further Gleanings from the Matsya Purāṇa [मत्स्यपुराण-  
प्रकीर्णविषयसंग्रहः—पूर्वतोऽनुवृत्तम्] 321—330  
*Dr. P. Rayhavan,* M. A., Ph. D. ;  
University of Madras
- Textual Notes [पाठसमीक्षा] 331—332  
*Sri Anand Swarup Gupta*

कूर्मपुराणविषयसूची [Kūrmapurāṇa-Concordance] 333—396

*Srī Ram Shankar Bhattacharya*, M. A., Vyākaraṇā-  
cārya ; i/c. Department of Purāṇa-Concordance,  
Sivālā Bhavana, Varanasi

Review of the work of the Purāṇa Department of  
the All-India Kashiraj Trust [ काशिराजन्यासीयपुराण-

विभागस्य कार्य-विवरणम् ] 397—403

*Srī Anand Swarup Gupta*, M.A. ;

i/c. Purāṇa Department,

All-India Kashiraj Trust

प्रथमपृष्ठसंलग्नचित्रविवरणम् 404

The Frontispiece (Description) 405

—: 0 :—

Illustration of Maharṣi Vyāsa.

(Frontispiece)









मुनीनामप्यहं व्यासः

*By Courtesy of*  
H. H. The Maharaja of Bamnagar

From a wall-painting in Mahārāja's Dev-temple of  
Ramnagar Fort.

## विष्णोरवतारः श्रीकृष्णद्वैपायनो व्यासः

नमस्कुरुध्वं तमृषिं कृष्णं सत्यवतीसुतम् ।

पाराशर्यं महात्मानं योगिनं विष्णुमव्ययम् ॥

( कूर्मपु०, १।३०।६८ )

पाराशर्यं परमपुरुषं विश्वदेवैक्योनिं ।

विद्यावन्तं विपुलमतिदं वेदवेदाङ्गवेद्यम् ॥

शश्वच्छान्तं शमितविषयं शुद्धनेजोविशालं ।

वेदव्यासं विगतशमलं सर्वदाऽहं नमामि ॥

( नरसिंहपु०, १।२५; पद्मपु०, आनन्दा०, १।१।१६ )

कृष्णद्वैपायनं व्यासं विद्धि नारायणं प्रभुम् ।

को ह्यन्यो भुवि मैत्रेय महाभारतकृद्भवेत् ॥

( विष्णुपु०, ३।४।५; पद्मपु०, ५।१।४३ )

ततः सप्तदशे<sup>१</sup> जातः सत्यवत्यां पराशरात् ।

चक्रो वेदतरोः शाखा दृष्ट्वा पुंसोऽरूपमेधसः ॥

( भाग० पु०, १।३।२१ )

द्वापरे समनुभासे तृतीये युगपर्यये ।

जातः पराशराद् योगी वासव्यां<sup>२</sup> कलया हरेः ॥

( तदेव, १।४।१४ )

---

१. श्रीमद्भागवते ( १।३।६-२५ ) हरेर्द्वाविंशतिरवताराः प्रोक्ताः । तेषामेव सप्तदशोऽवतारः पाराशर्यो वेदव्यास इति भागवतमतमनौद्भूतम् ।

२. अग्निव्रताख्यानां पितृणामच्छेदा नाम मानसी कन्या बभूव । सा पितृभिरपध्याता चेदिराजस्य वसोरुपरिचरस्य मत्स्ययोनिजा कन्या संजाता, अतः सा 'वासवी' इति ख्यातिं जगाम ( मत्स्यपु०, १।४।२-१४ ) । सैव 'मत्स्यगन्धा', 'काली' इति चोच्यते ( देवीभा०, २।१।३८, ३९ ) । तथा सह संजिगमिषोः पराशरस्य वरेण सा 'योजनगन्धा' ( मृगनाभिसुगन्धा ) सुरूपा च बभूव, 'सत्यवती' इति नाम्ना च प्रसिद्धिमगात् ( देवीभा०, २।२।१८-२० ) । अत्र विषये वायुपु० ( वेंकटे० ), पूर्वार्ध, १।३४-३६, तथा म०भा० ( चि० शा० प्रेस संस्क० ), आदिपर्व, अ० ६३ अपि द्रष्टव्यम् ।

नारदो व्यासं प्रति—

त्वमात्मनात्मानमवेद्वमोघदृक् परस्य पुंसः परमात्मनः कलम् ।  
अजं प्रजातं जगतः शिवाय तन्महानुभावाभ्युदयोऽधिगण्यताम् ॥  
( तदेव, ११५।२१ )

सूतः शौनकं प्रति —

अस्मिन्नप्यन्तरे ब्रह्मन् भगवाँल्लोकभावनः ।  
ब्रह्मेशाद्यैर्लोकपालैर्याचितो धर्मगुप्तये ॥  
पराशरात् सत्यवत्यामंशांशकल्या विभुः ।  
अवतीर्णो महाभाग वेदं चक्रे चतुर्विधम् ॥  
( तदेव, १२।६।४८, ४९ )

पराशरः सत्यवतीं प्रति —

शृणु सुन्दरि पुत्रस्ते विष्णवंशसम्भवः शुचिः ॥  
भविष्यति च विख्यातस्त्रैलोक्ये वरवर्णिनि ।  
( देवीभा०, २।२। ३० उ०—३१ पू० )

अष्टमे<sup>१</sup> द्वापरे विष्णुरष्टाविंशे पराशरात् ।  
वेदव्यासस्तथा जज्ञे जातुकर्ण्यपुरःसरः ॥  
( मत्स्यपु०, आनन्दा०, ४७।२४६ )

अस्मिन् युगे तदा व्यासः पाराशर्यः परंतपः ।  
द्वैपायन इति ख्यातो विष्णोरंशः सनातनः ॥  
( ब्रह्माण्डपु०, वैकटे०, पू० भा०, ३।४।११ )

तस्मै भगवते कृत्वा नमो व्यासाय वेधसे ।  
पुरुषाय पुराणाय भृगुवाक्यप्रवर्तिने ।  
मानुषच्छब्दरूपाय विष्णवे प्रभविष्णवे ॥ ३६ ॥  
जातमात्रं च यं वेद उपतस्थे ससंग्रहः ॥ ३७ पू० ।

(वायुपु०, वैकटे०, पूर्वा०, अ० १; पद्मपु०, आनन्दा०, ५।१।३६, ४०)

१. मत्स्यपुराणे ( आनन्दाश्रम०, ४७।२३७-२४८ ) विष्णोस्तिस्त्रो दिव्याः, सप्त च मानुषाः, एवं दश संभूतयः प्रोक्ताः । भगवान् पाराशर्यो वेदव्यासस्तु विष्णोरष्टमः प्रादुर्भावोऽत्र कथितः ।

वेदव्यासमुनिः साक्षान्नारायण इति द्विजाः ।

शुश्रुम सर्वशास्त्रेषु सूतस्तु व्यासशंसितः ॥

( नारदपु०, पू० भा०, १।१८ )

सूतो जनमेजयं प्रति—

नारायणांशसम्भूतं सत्यवत्याः सुतं सुधिम् ।

द्वैपायनं महाराज प्रष्टुमारेभिरे तदा ( ऋषयः ) ॥

स्वान्दपु०, मानसखण्डः ( नेपालदेशात्प्राप्तः कोशः ),

अ० १, श्लो० १४ ( पत्र २ पू० )

आनन्दस्वरूपगुप्त

## पुराणरत्नानि

स वै पुंसां परो धर्मो यतो भक्तिरधोक्षजै ।

अहैतुक्यप्रतिहता ययात्मा संप्रसीदति ॥

वासुदेवे भगवति भक्तियोगः प्रयोजितः ।

जनयत्याशु वैराग्यं ज्ञानं च यदहैतुकम् ॥

धर्मः स्वनुष्ठितः पुंसां विष्वक्सेनकथासु यः ।

नोत्पादयेद्यदि रतिं श्रम एव हि केवलम् ॥

( भाग० पु०, १।२।६-८ )

## THE GENIUS OF VYĀSA\*

[ अत्र श्रीअरविन्दकृतव्यासविषयकनिबन्धात् कतिचिदंशा उद्धृताः । अस्मिन् निबन्धे श्रीअरविन्देन महर्षेः कृष्णद्वैपायनाख्यस्य व्यासस्य प्रतिभायाः काव्यशैल्याश्च विशदं वर्णनं कृतम्, संस्कृतवाङ्मये तस्य रचनायाश्च महत्त्वं प्रतिपादितम् । आर्यसभ्यतायाः संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्य चेतिहासस्य सम्यगवबोधाय गृह्यभारतग्रन्थस्य वैज्ञानिकपद्धत्याऽध्ययनं तस्य चैकतो रामायणेन सह, अरतय पुराणैः सह सम्बन्धावधारणमावश्यकम् । व्यासस्य रचनासु तस्य रचनाशैल्या असाधारणत्वं तस्य प्रतिभायाश्च वशिष्ठ्यं पदे पदे लक्ष्यते । न केवलं संस्कृत-कवीनां मध्ये, अपि तु सभ्यजातौ विश्वेपामेव कवीनां मध्ये भगवतो व्यासस्य स्थानमुच्चतमं वर्तते । भावानां प्राधान्यमत्र क्लृप्ताणां च गौण्यं, शक्तिमत्त्वं, पौरुषेयत्वं, तेजस्विता, बुद्धिवैभवश्च श्रीव्यासस्य रचनाशैल्याः केचिद्विशेषाः श्रीअरविन्देन व्याख्याताः । व्यासस्य रचनासु यत्रैतेषां विशेषाणामभावो लक्ष्यते तत्र प्रज्ञाकाणां संश्लेषकानां वा हस्तोऽनुमीयते । भगवान् कृष्णद्वैपायनो महान् मनोषी, मौलिकविचारवान्, नोतिर्धर्मस्य च दृष्ट्याः परमविस्तारकश्चासीत् । ]

One is struck in perusing the works of Maharshi Krishna Dvaipāyana Vyāsa by the presence of a mass of poetry which bears the style and impress of a single, strong and original, even unusual mind, differing in his manner of expression, tone of thought and stamp of personality not only from every other Sanskrit poet we know, but from every other great poet known to literature.

Vyāsa is the most masculine of writers. When Coleridge spoke of the femineity of genius he had in mind certain features of temperament which, whether justly or not, are usually thought to count for more in the feminine mould than in the masculine, the love of ornament, emotionalism, mobile impressionability, the tyranny of imagination over the reason, excessive sensitiveness to form and outward beauty, tendency to be dominated imaginatively by violence and the show of strength;...failure in self-restraint is also feminine. All these are natural pro-

---

\* Adapted from Sri Aurobindo's *Vyasa and Valmiki* compiled from among the draft manuscripts of Sri Aurobindo, and published by Sri Aurobindo Ashram, Pondichery, November, 1950. Sri Aurobindo's paper on Vyāsa gives a vivid description of the genius, style and personality of Vyāsa.

perties of the quick artistic temperament prone to lose balance by throwing all itself outward and therefore seldom perfectly sane and strong in all its parts. So much did these elements form the basis of Coleridge's own temperament that he could not perhaps imagine a genius in which they are wanting. Yet Wordsworth, Goethe, Dante and Sophocles show however that the very highest genius can exist without them. But none of these great poets is so singularly masculine, so deficient in femininity as Vyāsa, none dominates so much by intellect and personality, yet satisfies so little the romantic imagination.

In his austere self-restraint and economy of power he is indifferent to ornament for its own sake, the pleasures of poetry as distinguished from its ardours, to little graces and indulgences of style. The substance counts for everything and the form has to limit itself to its proper work of expressing with precision and power the substance. Even his most romantic pieces have a virgin coldness and loftiness in their beauty....But to those who have bathed even a little in the fountain-head of poetry, and can bear the keenness and purity of these mountain sources, the naked and unadorned poetry of Vyāsa is as delightful as to bathe in a chill fountain in the heats of summer.

The style of this powerful writer is perhaps the one example in literature of strength in its purity, a strength undefaced by violence and excess, yet not weakened by flagging and negligence. It is less propped or helped out by any artifices and aids than any other poetic style. Vyāsa takes little trouble with similes, metaphors, rhetorical turns, the usual paraphernalia of poetry, nor when he uses them, is he at pains to select such as will be new and curiously beautiful; they are there to define more clearly what he has in mind, and he makes just enough of them for that purpose, never striving to convert them into a separate grace or a decorative element. They have force and beauty in their context but cannot be turned into elegant excerpts; in themselves they are, in fact, little or nothing.

His supreme intellect rises every-where out of the mass of insipid or turbulent redaction and interpolation with bare and grandiose outlines. *A wide searching mind, historian, statesman, orator, a deep and keen looker into ethics and conduct, a subtle and high aiming politician, theologian and philosopher, it is not for nothing that Hindu imagination makes the name of Vyāsa loom so large in the history of Aryan thought and attributes to him a work so important and manifold. The wideness of the man's intellectual empire is evident throughout the work ; we feel the presence of the great Rishi, the original thinker who has enlarged the boundaries of ethical and religious outlook.* (Italics mine)

Anand Swarup Gupta

— — — — —

जयति पराशरसूनुः

सत्यवतो हृदयनन्दनो व्यासः ।

यस्यास्यक्रमलालितं

वाङ्मयममृतं जगत् पिबति ॥ २ ॥

पाराशर्यवचःसरोजममलं गीतार्थगन्धोत्कटं

नानाख्यानककेसरं हरिकथासंबोधनाबोधितम् ।

लोके सज्जनपट्पदैरहरहः पेपीयमानं मुदा

भूयाद् भारतपङ्कजं कल्मलप्रध्वंसि नः श्रेयसे ॥ ४ ॥

अल्पायुषो लोकजनान्समीक्ष्य

विद्याविहीनान् पशुवत्सुचेष्टान् ।

तेषां सुखार्थं प्रतिबोधनाय

व्यासः पुराणं प्रथितं चकार ॥ ८ ॥

( भविष्यपु०, ब्राह्मपर्व, अ० १ )



## गजेन्द्रमोक्षणं नाम विष्णुस्तोत्रम्

( वामनपु०, वेंकटे०, ८५। ३२-६० )

( भाग०पु०, गीताप्रेस, ८।३।२-२६ )

[ स तु नागवरः श्रीमान् नारायणपरायणः ।  
तमेव शरणं देवं गतः सर्वात्मना तदा ॥२८॥  
एकात्मा निगृहीतात्मा विगृह्येनान्तरात्मना ।  
जन्मजन्मान्तराभ्यासाद् भक्तिमान् गङ्गद्वजे ॥  
१आद्यं देवं महादेवं पूजयामास केशवम् १ ।  
मथितामृतफेनाभं शङ्खचक्रगदाधरम् ॥३०॥  
सहस्रशुभनामानमादिदेवमर्जं विभुम् ।  
प्रगृह्य पुष्कराग्रेण काञ्चनं कमलोद्भवम् २ ।  
आपद्धिमोक्षमन्विच्छन् गजः स्तोत्रमुदैरयत् ३॥]

[ यः कश्चनेशो बलिनोऽन्तकोरगात्  
प्रचण्डवेगादभिषावतो भृशम् ।  
भीतं प्रपन्नं परिपाति यद्भया-  
न्मृत्युः प्रभावत्यरणं तमोमहि ॥  
( ८।२।३३ )  
एवं व्यवसितो बुद्ध्या समाधाय मनो हृदि ।  
जजाप परमं जाप्यं प्राग्जन्मन्यतुशिक्षितम् ॥  
( ८।३।१ ) ]

ॐ नमो मूलप्रकृतये

अजिताय महात्मने ।

अनाश्रिताय देवाय

निःस्पृहाय नमोऽस्तु ते ॥३२॥

नम आद्याय वामाय<sup>४</sup>

आर्षाय<sup>५</sup>दिप्रवर्तिने<sup>६</sup> ।

ॐ नमो भगवते तस्मै,

यत एतच्चिदात्मकम् ।

पुरुषायादिबीजाय,

परेशायाभिधीमहि ॥२॥

यस्मिन्निदं यतश्चेदं,

येनेदं य इदं स्वयम् ।

[ काशिराजपुराणविभागे वामनपुराणस्याद्यावधि सप्त कोशाः संवादिताः (collated). येषां परिचयः 'पुराण' पत्रिकायाः पूर्वस्मिन् (Vol. III, No. 1) अङ्के वर्तते । अन्यदपि कोशत्रयं ( काशोविश्वविद्यालयात्प्राप्तः शारदालिपिकोशः, एशियाटिकसोसाइटीसकाशात् प्राप्तः कश्मीरीलिपिकोशः, काशिराजसरस्वतीभण्डारा-  
त्प्राप्तो देवनागरीलिपिकोशश्च ) अस्मिन् गजेन्द्रमोक्षणप्रकरणे आकलितम् । तेषां मध्ये तेलुगुकोशोऽयमध्यायो नास्ति, पेनसिलवेनिया ( अमेरिका ) विश्वविद्यालयात्प्राप्तः कोशस्तु प्रायेण वेंकटे० संस्करणं संवदति । अत्र नवभ्यः कोशेभ्यः संगृहीतानि कतिचिदुपयोगीनि पाठान्तराण्यधो निर्दिश्यन्ते, येन वेंकटे० संस्करणस्य केचिदस्पष्टाः पाठाः स्पष्टाः भवेयुः, तथा प्राचीनाः शुद्धाश्च पाठा उद्धाटिताः सन्तः पाठकानां गवेषकाणां चोपकाराय कल्पेरन् । पाठान्तरयुतां कोशानां संख्याऽऽहृत्य कोष्ठेऽग्रे प्रदृश्यते । ]

१. नात्यं देवं महादेवात् पूजयामास केशवात् ( ८ कोशेषु ) । २. कमलोत्तमम् ( ८ ) ।

३. ०मुदैरयत् ( ८ ) । ४. बीजाय ( ७ ) । ५. आर्षेयाय ( ७ ) ।

६. ०य प्रवर्तिने ( ८ ) ।

अनन्तराय चैकाय

अव्यक्ताय नमो नमः ॥३३॥

नमो गुह्याय गूढाय

गुणाय गुणवर्तिने ।

अतर्क्याप्रमेयाय<sup>७</sup>

अतुलाय नमो नमः ॥३४॥

नमः शिवाय शान्ताय

निश्चिन्तार्थं यशस्विने ।

सनातनाय पूर्वाय

पुराणाय नमो नमः ॥३५॥

नमोऽस्तु तस्मै देवाय

निर्गुणाय गुणात्मने<sup>८</sup> ।

नमो जगत्प्रतिष्ठाय

गोविन्दाय नमो नमः ॥३६॥

नमोऽस्तु पञ्चनाभाय

सांख्ययोगोद्भवाय च ।

विश्वेश्वराय देवाय

शिवाय हरये नमः ॥३७॥

नमोऽस्तु तस्मै देवाय

निर्गुणाय गुणात्मने ।

नारायणाय विश्वाय

देवाय<sup>९</sup> परमात्मने ॥३८॥

नमो नमः कारणवामनाय

नारायणायामितविक्रमाय ।

श्रीशार्ङ्गचक्रासिगदाधराय

नमोऽस्तु तस्मै पुरुषोत्तमाय ॥३९॥

योऽस्मात् परस्माच्च परस्,

तं प्रपद्ये स्वयम्भुवम् ॥३॥

यः स्वात्मनीदं निजमाययार्पितं

क्वचिद् विभातं क्व च तत् तिरोहितम् ।

अविद्वद्वक् साक्ष्युभयं तदीक्षते

स आत्ममूलोऽवतु मां परात्परः ॥४॥

कालेन पञ्चत्वमितेषु कृत्स्नशो

लोकेषु पालेषु च सर्वहेतुषु ।

तमस्तदाऽऽसौद् गहनं गभीरं

यस्तस्य पारेऽभिविराजते विभुः ॥५॥

न यस्य देवा ऋषयः पदं विदु-

र्जन्तुः पुनः कोऽर्हति गन्तुमीमिभुः

यथा नटस्थाकृतिभिर्विचैष्टतो

दुरत्ययानुक्रमणः स माऽवतु ॥६॥

दिदृक्षवो यस्य पदं सुमङ्गलं

विमुक्तसङ्गा मुनयः सुसाधवः ।

चरन्त्यलोकाव्रतमव्रणं वने

भूतात्मभूताः सुहृदः स मे गतिः ॥७॥

न विद्यते यस्य च जन्म कर्म वा

न नामरूपे गुणदोष एव वा ;

तथापि लोकाप्ययसंभवाय यः

स्वमायथा तान्यनुकालमृच्छति ॥८॥

तस्मै नमः परेशाय, ब्रह्मणेऽनन्तशक्तः

अरूपायोरुत्तमाय, नमः आश्चर्यकर्मण ॥९॥

नमः आत्मप्रदीपाय,

साक्षिणे परमात्मने ।

७. अप्रतर्क्याप्रमेयाय (६) । ८. निश्चिन्ताय (३) । ९. नमो देवाधिदेवाय  
स्वभावाय नमो नमः (८) । १०. देवानां (८) ।

गुह्याय वेदनिलयाय महोरगाय <sup>११</sup>	नमो गिरां विदूराय,
सिंहाय दैत्यनिघनाय चतुर्भुजाय ।	मनसश्चेतसामपि ॥ १० ॥
ब्रह्मेन्द्ररुद्रमुनिचारणसंस्तुताय	सत्त्वेन प्रतिलभ्याय,
देवोत्तमाय सकलाय <sup>१२</sup> नमोऽच्युताय <sup>१३</sup> ॥ ४०	नैष्कर्म्येण विपश्चिता ।
नागेन्द्रभोगशयनाय <sup>१४</sup> च सुप्रियाय <sup>१५</sup>	नमः कैवल्यनाथाय,
गोक्षीरहेमशुकनीलघनोपमाय <sup>१६</sup> ।	निर्वाणसुखसंविदे ॥ ११ ॥
पीताम्बराय मधुकैटभनाशनाय	नमः शान्ताय धोराय,
विश्वाद्यचारमुकुटाय नमोऽक्षराय <sup>१७</sup> ॥ ४१ ॥	मूढाय गुणधर्मिणे ।
नाभिप्रजातकमलस्थचतुर्भुजाय	निर्विशेषाय साम्याय,
क्षीरोदकार्णवनिकेतयशोधराय ।	नमो ज्ञानघनाय च ॥ १२ ॥
नानाविचित्रकनकाङ्गदभूषणाय <sup>१८</sup>	क्षेत्रज्ञाय नमस्तुभ्यं,
सर्वेश्वराय वरदाय नमो वराय ॥ ४२ ॥	सर्वाध्यक्षाय साक्षिणे ।
भक्ति <sup>१९</sup> प्रियाय वरदीप्तसुदर्शनाय	पुरुषायात्ममूलाय,
देवेन्द्रविघ्नशमनोद्यतपौरुषाय ।	मूलप्रकृतये नमः ॥ १३ ॥
फुल्लारविन्दविमलायतलोचनाय	सर्वेन्द्रियगुणद्रष्टे,
योगेश्वराय वरदाय <sup>२०</sup> नमो वराय ॥ ४३ ॥ <sup>२२</sup>	सर्वप्रत्ययहेतवे ।
ब्रह्मायनाय त्रिदशायनाय	असताच्छाययोक्ताय,
<sup>२३</sup> लोकायनायात्महितायनाय <sup>२३</sup> ।	सदाभासाय ते नमः ॥ १४ ॥
नारायणायात्मविकाशनाय <sup>२४</sup>	नमो नमस्तेऽखिलकारणाय
महावराहाय नमः <sup>२५</sup> सुरोऽसि <sup>२५</sup> ॥ ४४ ॥	निष्कारणायाद्भुतकारणाय ।

११ महोदराय (८) । १२ वरदाय (८) । १३. नमोऽव्ययाय (२), नमोऽव्ययाय (३) । १४. नागेन्द्रभोगशयनासनसुप्रियाय (१), नागेन्द्रदेहशयनासनसु० (७) । १५. ०द्यनोत्तमाय (२) । १६. विश्वाय चा० (७) । १७. नमोऽजराय (५) । १८. ०कमलाय चतुर्भुजाय (२) । १९. ०त्रमुकुटाङ्गद० (७) । २०. भक्तप्रि० (१) । २१. विरजाय (६) । २२. अस्य ४३ श्लोकस्य द्वितीयतृतीयपादौ परस्परं परिवर्तितक्रमौ विद्येते (६) । २३. लोकाधिनाथाय भयापहाय (शारदाकोशे), लोकाधिनाथाय भवापनाय (भा० ह० सं० मं० पूनाकोशे) । २४. ०णायात्महितायनाय (६) । २५. नमस्करोमि (८) ।

कूटस्थमव्यक्तमचिन्त्यरूपं

नारायणं कारणमादिदेवम् ।

युगान्तशेषं पुरुषं पुरातनं<sup>२६</sup>

तं देवदेवं<sup>२७</sup> शरणं प्रपद्ये ॥४५॥

योगेश्वरं चारुविचित्रमौलि

मज्ञेयमग्न्यं प्रकृतेः परस्थम् ।

क्षेत्रज्ञमात्मप्रभवं वरेण्यं

तं वासुदेवं शरणं प्रपद्ये ॥४६॥<sup>२८</sup>

अदृश्यमव्यक्तमचिन्त्यमव्ययं

ब्रह्मर्षयो<sup>२९</sup> ब्रह्ममयं सनातनम् ।

वदन्ति यं वै पुरुषं सनातनं<sup>३०</sup>

तं देवगुह्यं शरणं प्रपद्ये ॥४७॥

यदक्षरं ब्रह्म वदन्ति सर्वगं

निश्चयं यं<sup>३१</sup> मृत्युमुखात्प्रमुच्यते ।

तमीश्वरं तृप्तमनुत्तमैर्गुणैः

परायणं विष्णुमुपैमि शाश्वतम् ॥४८॥

कार्यं<sup>३२</sup> क्रियाकारणमप्रमेयं

हिरण्यनाभं<sup>३३</sup> वरपद्मनाभम् ।

महाबलं देवनिधिं<sup>३४</sup> सुरेशं

ब्रजामि विष्णुं शरणं जनार्दनम् ॥४९॥

किरोत्केयूरमहार्हनिष्कै-

र्मण्युत्तमालंकृतसर्वगात्रम् ।

पीताम्बरं काञ्चनभक्तिचित्रं

मालाधरं केशवमभ्युपैमि ॥५०॥

सर्वागमाभ्याय महार्णवाय

नमोऽपवर्गाय परायणाय ॥१५॥

गुणारणिच्छन्नचिदूष्मपाय

तत्क्षोभविस्फूर्जितमानसाय ।

नैष्कर्म्यभावेन विवर्जितागम-

स्वयंप्रकाशाय नमस्करोमि ॥१६॥

मादृक्प्रपन्नपशुपाशविमोक्षणाय

मुक्ताय भूरिकरुणाय नमोऽलयाय ।

स्वांशेन सर्वतनुभृन्मनसि प्रतीत-

प्रत्यग्दृशे भगवते बृहते नमस्ते ॥१७॥

आत्मात्मजातगृहवित्तजनेषु सत्ते-

र्तुष्प्रापणाय गुणसंगविवर्जिताय ।

मुक्तात्मभिः स्वहृदये परिभाविताय

ज्ञानात्मने भगवते नम ईश्वराय ॥१८॥

यं धर्मकामार्थविमुक्तिकामा

भजन्त इष्टां गतिमाप्नुवन्ति ।

किं त्वाशिषो रात्यपि देहमव्ययं

करोतु मेऽदभ्रदयो विमोक्षणम् ॥१९॥

एकान्तिनो यस्य न कश्चनार्थ

वाञ्छन्ति ये वै भगवत्प्रपन्नाः ।

अत्यद्भुतं तच्चरितं सुमङ्गलं

गायन्त आनन्दसमुद्रमग्नः ॥२०॥

तमक्षरं ब्रह्म परं परेश-

मव्यक्तमाध्यात्मिकयोगगम्यम् ।

२६. पुराणं (८) । २७. वासुदेवं (२) । २८. अयं श्लोकः ५ कोशेषु नास्ति ।  
२९. महर्षयो (८) । ३०. पुरातनं (४) । ३१. यन्मृ० (२) । ३२. कार्यक्रिया० (२) ।  
३३. ०ष्मपादं (८) । ३४. वेद० (३) ।

तारोद्भवं <sup>३५</sup> वेदविदां वरिष्ठं	अतीन्द्रियं सूक्ष्ममिवातिदूर-
योगात्मनां सांख्यविदां वरिष्ठम् ।	मनन्तमाद्यं परिपूर्णमोडे ॥२१॥
आदित्यरुद्राश्विनसुप्रभावं <sup>३६</sup>	यस्य ब्रह्मादयो देवा,
प्रभुं प्रपद्येऽच्युतमादिभूतम् <sup>३७</sup> ॥५१॥	वेदा लोकाश्चराचराः ।
श्रीवत्साङ्गं महादेवं	नामरूपविभेदेन,
देवगुह्यं मनोरमम् <sup>३८</sup> ।	फलमव्या च कलया कृताः ॥२२॥
प्रपद्ये सुक्ष्ममत्तुलं <sup>३९</sup>	यथार्चिषोऽग्नेः सवितुर्गमस्तथो
वरेण्यमभयप्रदम् ॥५२॥	निर्यान्ति संयान्त्यसकृन् स्वरोचिषः ।
प्रभवं सर्वभूतानां	तथा यतोऽयं गुणसंप्रवाहो
निर्गुणं परमेश्वरम् ।	बुद्धिर्मनः खानि शरीरसर्गाः ॥२३॥
प्रपद्ये मुक्तसङ्गानां	स वै न देवासुरमर्त्यतिर्यङ्-
यतीनां परमां गतिम् ॥५३॥	न स्त्री न षण्डो न पुमान् न जन्तुः ।
भगवन्तं गुणा <sup>४०</sup> ध्यक्ष-	नार्यं गुणः कर्म न सत्र चासन्-
मक्षरं पुष्करेक्षणम् ।	निषेधशेषो जयतादशेषः ॥२४॥
शरण्यं शरणं भक्त्या	जिजीविषे नाहमिहामुया कि-
प्रपद्ये भक्तवत्सलम् ॥५४॥	मन्तर्बहिश्चावृतयेभ्योन्या ।
त्रिविक्रमं त्रिलोकेशं	इच्छामि कालेन न यस्य विप्लव-
सर्वेषां प्रणितामहम् ।	स्तस्यात्मलोकावरणस्य मोक्षम् ॥२५॥
योगात्मानं महात्मानं	सोऽहं विश्वसृजं विश्व-
प्रपद्येऽहं जनार्दनम् ॥५५॥	मविश्वं विश्ववेदसम् ।
आदिदेवमजं शशुं	विश्वात्मानमजं ब्रह्म,
व्यक्ताव्यक्तं सनातनम् ।	प्रणतोऽस्मि परं पदम् ॥२६॥
नारायणमणीयांसं	योगरन्धितकर्माणो,
प्रपद्ये ब्राह्मणप्रियम् ॥५६॥	हृदि योगविभाविते ।

३५. भवो० (५), भद्रो० (२) । ३६. ०द्राखिलशुभ्रभावं (१), ०द्राखिलशुद्ध-  
भावं (१) । ३७. ०मात्मवन्तं (७), ०मात्मरूपात् (१) । ३८. ०ह्यमनौपमम् (७) ।  
३९. ०मचलं (८) । ४०. युगा० (२) ।

नमो हराय<sup>४१</sup> देवाय  
नमः सर्वमहाय<sup>४२</sup> च ।  
प्रपद्ये देवदेवेश-  
मणीयांसं तनोः<sup>४३</sup> सदा ॥५७॥  
एकाय लोकतत्त्वाय<sup>४४</sup>  
परतः<sup>४५</sup> परमात्मने<sup>४६</sup> ।  
नमः सहस्रशिरसे  
अनन्ताय महात्मने ॥५८॥  
त्वमेव शरणं<sup>४७</sup> देव-  
मृषयो वेदपारगाः ।  
कीर्तयन्ति च यं सर्वे  
ब्रह्मादीनां परायणम् ॥५९॥

नमस्ते पुण्डरीकाक्ष

भक्तानामभयप्रद ।

अब्रह्मण्य<sup>४८</sup> नमस्तेऽस्तु

त्राहि मां शरणागतम् ॥६०॥

[ य इदं श्रुत्वा नित्यं प्रातस्तथाय मानवः ।

प्राप्नुयात्तारकां सिद्धिं दुःस्वप्नश्च विनश्यति ॥

गजेन्द्रमोक्षणं पुसां सर्वपापप्रणाशनम् ।

कथितेन स्मृतेनाथ श्रुतेन च तपोधन ॥

( ८५।८१, ८२ ; ]

योगिनो यं प्रपश्यन्ति,  
योगेशं तं नतोऽस्म्यहम् ॥२७॥

नमो नमस्तुभ्यमसद्वेग-

शक्तित्रयायास्त्रिलधीगणाय ।

प्रपन्नपालाय दुरन्तशक्तये

कदिन्द्रियाणामनवाप्यवर्त्मने ॥२८॥

नायं वेद स्वमात्मानं,

यच्छक्त्याहं, धिया हतम् ।

तं दुरत्ययमाहात्म्यं,

भगवन्तमितोऽस्म्यहम् ॥२९॥

[ श्रीशुक उवाच—

एतन्महाराज तवेरितो मया ।

कुष्णानुभावो गजराजमोक्षणम् ॥

स्वर्ग्यं यशस्यं कलिकल्मषापहं ।

दुःस्वप्ननाशं कुरुत्रयं शृण्वताम् ॥

श्रीभगवानुवाच—

ये मां स्तुवन्त्यनेनाङ्ग प्रतिबुध्य निशात्यये ।

तेषां प्राणात्यये चाहं ददामि विमलां मतिम् ॥

( ८५।१४, २५ ) ]

The Gajendra-mokṣaṇa is one of the most famous and inspiring stotras of the Purāṇas. The Vāmana Purāṇa calls it the most sacred stotra or prayer ('जायं परमं पवित्रम्' 84.42), and the Bhāgavata also calls it the best stotra (VIII. 3. I). In this stotra the great

४१. वराय ( ६ ) । ४२. महाराय ( ३ ), महाराय ( ५ ) । ४३. मणीमणोः  
सदा ( २ ), मणोरपि ( ४ ), मनीषमं ( २ ) । ४४. एकतन्त्राय ( १ ) ।  
४५. भाविनाय परात्मने ( १ ), भाविनाय परात्मने ( १ ) । ४६. परमं ( ८ ) ।  
४७. मृषाण्य ( ८ ) ।

Elephant who, while enjoying his refreshing bath in the pool of the golden lotuses situated on the Trikūta mountain, is caught hold of by the great Crocodile, the Gandharva Hūhū of the previous birth, offers his prayers to Viṣṇu, as a result of which he obtains his release.

The stotra is full of the devotional spirit and the deep philosophical ideas. Viṣṇu is here described both in his *nirguṇa* and *saṃguṇa* aspects. He is both *nirguṇa* and *guṇātman* (Vām.), *arūpa* and *ururūpa*, *nirviśeṣa* and *guṇa-dharmīn* (Bhāg.) In his *nirguṇa* aspect He is the unmanifest and the primordial cause of the universe (*avyakta* and *mūla-prakṛti*). He is the highest Reality, eternal and changeless (*para*, *nitya* and *kūṭastha*), He is One (*eka*) without the second, He is beyond the *Prakṛti*, and beyond the reach of the senses and thoughts (*adrśya*, *acintya*). In his *saṃguṇa* aspect. He is the *Viśva*. The whole universe is his manifestation, His *saṃguṇa* form, and as such He has innumerable forms and names (*sahasra-śīras* and *sahasra-subhānāman*). This stotra contains the lofty ideas, and even the very words, of the Upaniṣads and the Bh.Gītā (cf. यदक्षरं ब्रह्म वदन्ति सर्वे 48a, and 'निशम्य यं मुल्युमुखात्प्रमुच्यते' 48 b of the Vām. Stotra with 'यदक्षरं वेदविदो वदन्ति' Bh. Gītā, 8. 11a and 'निचाप्य तन्मुल्युमुखात्प्रमुच्यते' Kāṭha Up., 1. 3. 15d respectively).

The Gajendra-mokṣaṇa-Stotra as given in the Bhāg. (VIII. 3. 2-29), though consisting of almost the same number of ślokaś as in the Vām. is different from this stotra of the Vāmana Purāṇa. The Bhāgavata-stotra is more permeated by the Vedantic spirit, and the pantheistic tone also prevails there to a greater extent. But the Gajendra-mokṣaṇa-stotra of the Vāmana Purāṇa seems to be traditionally more favourite, as it has been included in an old compilation named the *Pañcarātrāgītā* published by the Venkṛteśvara Press, Bombay, and the Gītā Press, Gorakhpur.

The Gajendra-mokṣaṇa episode has always been a favourite theme with the Bhakti-literature of India. It

has been given in the Purāṇas such as the Vāmana (Adh. 85) and the Bhāgavata (VIII. 2-4). It has also inspired the medieval Bhakti poetry of India, written in Hindi and other regional languages of the country by such poet-saints as Sūra and Tulasī.

The Stotra is said to have the efficacy of destroying all sins and evil dreams of a person who recites or listens to it. After the last śloka of Adh. 85 (which Adh. is also named as *Gajendra-mokṣaṇa*) of the Venkṭeśvara edition of the Vāmana-Purāṇa, the following additional śloka has been given in the six mss. of the Vāmana Purāṇa, including the Bengali one (No. 3989 of the H. P. Shastri's Catalogue, Vol. V and deposited in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta) :—

पुनस्त्य उवाच—

एतत्तदोक्तं प्रवरं स्तवानां स्तवं सुरारेवैरनागकीर्तितम् ।

यं कीर्त्य संश्रुत्य तथा विचिन्त्य पापानोदं पुरुषो लभेत ॥ ]

Both these Gajendra-mokṣaṇa-stotras of the Vāmana and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas, though differing from each other, have also striking similarities in some of their ideas and expressions. They use several similar epithets (such as *Kṣetrajña*, *Mūla-Prakṛti* etc.) in praise of Viṣṇu. Again, as noted above, both the Purāṇas record the similar *phalaśruti* of this Stotra. According to both the Purāṇas this stotra destroys all sins and prevents evil dreams (दुःस्वप्न). Both, again, recommend to remember and think of the same pond of lotuses, the same mountain Trikūṭa, the same trees and bushes, the same rivers, and also the same *Aratīāras* of Viṣṇu, immediately after rising in the morning (cf. Vām., 85.69-73, and Bhāg., 8.4.17-23). Thus it is clear that both these versions of the Gajendra-mokṣaṇa-stotra are rooted in the same tradition; though later on the Gajendra-mokṣaṇa-stotra of the Vāmana Purāṇa might have become more popular as hinted above.]

ANAND SWARUP GUPTA



## KADRŪ-VINATĀ AND THE WAGER

By

SADASHIV A. DANGE

[ कद्रूविनतयोः कथायाः संस्कृतवाङ्मये क्रमशो विकासः कथमभूदिति निबन्धेऽस्मिन् प्रदर्शितम् । ऋग्वेदे सुपर्ण-श्थेनस्य सोमाहरणमेव केवलमुप-  
वांशितम्, 'कद्रूः' 'विनता' च तत्र नोक्ते । उत्तरकालीनसंहितासु ब्राह्मण-  
ग्रन्थेषु च कद्रूः पृथिवीरूपेण, सुपर्णी (= विनता) च कदाचिद् द्यौरिति कदाचिच्च  
वागिति व्याख्याता, छन्दांसि च सौपर्णानिति प्रोक्तानि यज्ञकाण्डस्य महत्त्व-  
प्रदर्शनार्थम् । 'विनता' शब्दस्तु तत्र नोपलभ्यते, एष शब्दः प्रथमं सुपर्णा-  
ध्यायनान्नि प्राचीनग्रन्थे एव दृश्यते तत्र कद्रूविनतोपाख्याने 'सुपर्णी' 'विनता'  
इति चोभौ शब्दौ वर्तते, पणस्य चापि तत्रोल्लेखः प्राप्यते । तत्रापि कद्रूभूमिः  
विनता च द्यौरित्युक्तम् । सुपर्णाध्याये विनतायाः 'शुङ्गी' इत्याभिधानमपि  
प्रोक्तम् । महाभारते पुराणेषु च कद्रूविनतोपाख्याने विनतायाः 'सुपर्णी'  
'शुङ्गी' इत्यादीनि नामानि नोपलभ्यन्ते केवलं 'विनता' इति नामैव तत्राव-  
शिष्टम् । तत्र कद्रूविनताशब्दयोश्च प्रतीकव्याख्यापि न विद्यते, केवलमाख्यान-  
मात्रमेव तत्र वर्तते । 'कद्रू'शब्दस्य 'पृथिवी'ति व्याख्या तु समानैव, परन्तु  
'सुपर्णी' 'विनता' वा शब्दस्य व्याख्याविषये विप्रतिपत्तिर्वर्तते । लेखकमहो-  
दयस्य मते तु 'सुपर्णी' 'शुङ्गी' इति शब्दयोः 'न्यग्रोधः' इत्येवार्थो भवितुमर्हति ।  
रामायणेऽप्यत्र च गरुडस्य न्यग्रोवेन सह संसर्गः प्रसिद्धः । अत एव सुपर्णी  
( शुङ्गी, न्यग्रोधः ) गरुडस्य माता तस्याश्रयभूतत्वात्, कद्रूः ( पृथिवी ) च  
सर्पाणां माता तेषां तत्र विलेखवस्थानात् । पश्चाच्च सपत्न्योः परस्परं विद्वेषः  
पणवार्त्ताज्ये च केचित् कथांशास्तदानीन्तनोभ्यो लोककथाभ्यः संगृह्य तत्र  
संयोजिताः, कद्रूविनताशब्दयोश्च प्रतीकात्मकता तिरोभूता । ]

The students of Hindu Mythology are quite familiar with the names Kadrū and Vinatā. These two prominently figure in the context of the rivalry between the nāgas on one side and Garuḍa on the other. These two themselves are said to have been contesting parties in the famous wager about the tail of the steed of the sun. The wager of these wives of Kāśyapa forms an important part of the Ādi Parvan of the

Mahābhārata,<sup>1</sup> and is to be found also in the Purāṇas.<sup>2</sup> Even before the period of the epic the wager of these two could be traced right into the later Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. The 'Suparṇādhyaṃya'—a work of the late Brāhmaṇa period—completely deals with the wager and the final victory of Garuḍa and his mother-Vinatā—over the serpents and their mother-Kadrū. The Taittirīya Saṁhitā (VI-1-6-) the Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā (XXXIII-10); the Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā (III-7-8); and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa—(III-2-4-1ff) also record the wager. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Taittirīya Saṁhitā give the account of the wager quite elaborately. It should be noted, however, that these two names—viz. Kadrū and Vinatā are not common to all the texts that make their mention. The 'Suparṇādhyaṃya', the Epics and the Purāṇas have both Kadrū and Vinatā; but going back to the Brāhmaṇas the matter is different. The name Kadrū is known to the Brāhmaṇas and the Saṁhitās, but the name of Vinatā is absent therein. The name Vinatā gets currency from the 'Suparṇādhyaṃya' onwards. In the Vedic texts that we have mentioned above, we have 'Suparṇī' in the account of the wager where we would expect Vinatā. About the identification in the case of Kadrū and Suparṇī we have the following account in the Brāhmaṇical literature :—

Kadrū is said to be this Earth; while Suparṇī is sometimes identified with 'Vāk' and sometimes with the Heavens.<sup>3</sup> The 'Suparṇādhyaṃya' has often 'Suparṇī' as the name of Garuḍa's mother<sup>4</sup>, but along with it we have the name Vinatā also often mentioned. In the Mahābhārata, (Mb.) however, the name Vinatā completely obscures the name 'Suparṇī', and the same

1. For the wager see—Mb. I-14ff (BORI).

2. Cf. Skanda P. III (i. e. Brahmakhaṇḍa)—38ff; IV (Kāśī Khaṇḍa)—50; V (Avantī Khaṇḍa)—72 ff.; Padma P. V.

3. Cf. Kāthaka Saṁh. XXXIII-10 'इयं वै कद्रुर्वी; सुपर्णी'; Maitrāyaṇī Saṁh. (III-7-8); 'इयं वै कद्रुर्वीसुपर्णी'; Śatapatha Br. (Kāṇva)—V-6-2, 'वारुवे सुपर्णी, इयं कद्रुः.....'

4. Cf. Suparṇādhyaṃya—I-2-1, VI-11-3 etc. etc. (Ed. according to Jas. Carpenter—'Die Suparnasago' Uppasala-1920).

is the case with the Purāṇas. Kadrū, the mother of the *Sarpas* according to the Brāhmaṇas is later the same as the mother of the nāgas. She is '*Sarparājñī*'<sup>1</sup>, who is said to be the earth. She is also identified with *Surasā* which also is the earth.<sup>2</sup> Vinatā, identified with Suparṇī.....who is the 'Heaven' (dyauh) according to the Brāhmaṇas... ..also came to be identified with the Heaven; and, thus, Heaven and Earth came to compete with one another. It is this identification of Kadrū with the Earth and of Vinatā with the Heaven that we find in the Suparṇādhyāya.<sup>3</sup> The Mb. and the Purāṇas do not indulge in this identification and just record the story of their wager as if the two were real persons giving birth to the rivals—the serpents and Garuḍa.

Vogel tries to give the interpretation of the words—Kadrū and Vinatā. According to him the word *Kadrū* meaning '*tauny*' and *Vinatā* meaning '*vent*' are suggestive of the colour of the earth and the curve of the Vault of the heaven respectively.<sup>4</sup> According to Barth, Kadrū is darkness personified.<sup>5</sup> This does not sound proper in the face of the textual reference to the identification between Kadrū and the earth. It will be good to see in this context the other epithets of these two—i. e. of Kadrū and Vinatā, so as to have a fuller idea of their true nature. Now Kadrū is also said to be 'Kāpā' (because?) her eyes had been lost due to the smoke of the offerings.<sup>7</sup> Suparṇī also has another name, viz. '*Suṅgi*', and at some other places '*Suṅgā*', whence Garuḍa gets the name '*Saungeya*'.<sup>8</sup> Jai Charpentier notes these names in his 'Die Suparnasage'

1. Cf. Vājasaneyī Sāh III-5 and Sayana thereon; also Taittirīya Sāh. I-5-4.

2. Cf. Hopkins—'Epic Mythology' p. 23. The Nāgas are also called 'Saurasēyāḥ' for which see 'Suparṇādhyāya'—V-2-2, also Mb. (BORI)—XII-348-3.

3. Cf. Suparna-Adh.-I-2-1 'द्यावापृथिव्यौ भवतो भगिन्यौ ते मूर्तिमत्यौ चरतस्तु लोके । द्यौरासीत् तत्र विनता सुपर्णी भूमिस्तु नागी अभवत् कद्रूनामा ॥'

4. 'The Indian Serpent Lore' (London-1923) p. 51.

5. 'Religions of India' (London, 1882) p. 265.

6. Suparna-Adhyāya-III-5-4

7. Ibid. I-2-2.

8. Ibid. Suparna Adh. IV-8-3; IX-17-4, 5.

while commenting on the stanzas : but does not give any definite clue to them. These names (or better, epithets) do not occur in the Mb, or the Purāṇas ; but are very important in as much as they tend to offer the inner implication of the words 'Kadrū' and 'Vinatā' ; and their peculiar wager. The Brāhmaṇas and the Saṁhitās that refer to these two and their wager have one thing in common which is absent in the epics and the Purāṇas. According to these ancient texts these two competed as regards their *form*. ('Svarūpa').<sup>1</sup> Now it can be clear why Kadrū is called 'Kāṇā', and Vinatā 'Suparṇī.' Kadru, being herself 'Kāṇā'-(squint-eyed), would naturally (and psychologically) want to show off the strength of her eyes to cover the defect or to prove that the defect did not matter. And in this context the wager in which the condition was to see the tail of the Sun's steed requiring sharp eyes would be perfectly fitting ! This defective personality of Kadru is discernible in her very name—'Kad' + 'rū', the first part 'kad' meaning 'incomplete', 'improper'.<sup>2</sup> It is possible that the other part *rū* retains in itself the original sense of the word '*rūpa*' which is constantly to be seen in the words 'ātmarūpayoh'.

The wager between Kadrū and Vinatā (Suparṇī) is well rooted in the ancient texts and Charpentier seems to be right in stating that the wager between the two might have originally been a saga in which two contesting personalities were involved, who were later identified with Heaven and Earth.<sup>3</sup> But whereas it is possible to agree with Jai Charpentier in this point, it is not possible to take in entirety his view that the saga originally came from the '*wagering animals*'. It, more naturally, resembles such numerous folk-tales where two wives of the same person—one defective or wicked and the other attractive or sober—compete for supremacy, and the one with the evil nature

1. Cf. Taitt. Sañ. VI-1-6-1 = Kāthaka Sañ. XXX-10 'ātmarūpayoh'. Suparṇādhyaṃ has 'Svarūpayoh'. (III-5-8).

2. Compare such words as 'Kadannam', 'Kadartha' where 'Kad' means 'Kutaśite'.

3. Cf. 'Die Suparnasage', p. 306.

wins with deceit, only to be retaliated with a counter-blow.<sup>1</sup> Whatever might be the original nature of Kadrū and Vinatā, one thing seems to be pretty clear that these two were rivals. Kadrū, as we have already noted, can be traced to the Vedic literature without any change in the name, and we can take for granted that it was the earth; but such is not the case with Vinatā. Sometimes she is identified with the *Heaven* and sometimes with *Vāk*. Her name also is not fixed. This suggests that originally she was something different from the *Vāk* or the *Heaven*. It is true that she is said to be the mother of the metres. But even there it appears that the metres are named after her and get the name 'Sauparṇāni' or 'Sauparṇeyāḥ'.<sup>2</sup> There is the mention of a '*Sauparṇam Akhyānam*'<sup>3</sup> which is also called '*Sauparṇā-Kādravam*'<sup>4</sup>, and at every step the metres are said to be '*Sauparṇas*'. Gāyatrī is also said to be Sauparṇāḥ.<sup>5</sup> This goes to suggest that the 'ākhyāna' named 'Sauparṇī-Kādravam',<sup>6</sup> is utilised to enhance the importance of the metres; that it was originally separate, and that at a later stage it was adjusted in the sacrificial ritual. Going still back we find that in the R̥gveda<sup>7</sup> *suparṇa-śyena* is said to bring Soma; but there is no mention of Suparṇī or Kadrū therein, nor do the metres figure therein. The wager is totally absent in the R̥gveda. This poses before us the following distinct stages:

- i. Bringing of Soma by Śyena-suparṇa in the R̥gveda.
- ii. Identification of the metres with Suparṇa (Śyena) in the period later than the R̥gveda Saṁhitā; the

1. A number of such tales can be mentioned. Cf. the famous tale of 'Dhruva'; the story of Balaṅgama current in the South, etc. etc.

2. Cf. Kāthaka Samh. XXX-10; Mairāyaṇi Sam III-7-8; etc. etc.

3. Cf. Aitareya Br. III-25 ff; Tāṇḍya Mahā Br. VIII-4.

4. Śatapatha Br. III-2-1-1 ff. (Kaṇva)

5. The exact quotations are—Kāthaka Saṁhitā (q. b.) 'इयं वै कद्रूः सुपर्णी छन्दांसि सौपर्णानि'; Mairāyaṇi — 'छन्दांसि सौपर्णानि गायत्री, त्रिष्टुप्, जगती'

6. The 'Sauparṇākhyāna' or the 'Sauparṇī-Kādravam' as it is called, deals with the bringing of Soma by Suparṇa.

7. Cf. R̥gv. IV-25-4, ff.

purpose being to extol the sacrificial ritual and the mantras therein.

- iii. The then-current account (ākhyāna) of the wager between Kadrū and Suparṇī (also called, 'Śungi', Vinatā), whatever their real nature might be.

One interesting thing to be noted in this context is that, though the Brāhmaṇa literature speaks of the metres as Sauparṇas establishing their relation with the word 'Suparṇī', we have no trace yet of the sons of Kadrū in this context. It is surprising enough that in the account of the wager of Kadrū and Vinatā, the serpents should not figure, even though Kadrū is recognised to be the mother of the serpents in the Brāhmaṇas and Saṁhitās themselves as can be known from the epithet 'Sarpaijñī', applied to her and from the word 'Āṇḍraveya'. Then, it seems most probable in this case that the wager between these two was part of a different tale altogether and was used in the settings of the sacrificial ritual in the same way as the Rgvedic idea of the bringing of Soma by Śyena-suparṇa was used to extol the metres.

In the original form the tale of the wager seems to be just like the tales where the son of the ill-treated but good-natured wife becomes successful—say of the type of the famous tale of Dhruva, who being humiliated by his step-mother goes away and attains the immortal and stable place. The tale of Ghul-Bakāvali, widely known, is of the same type.<sup>1</sup> In the 'Balanagammā', we have already referred to, the son of a queen ultimately becomes successful in saving his mother. When the Rgvedic 'Somāharaya' account was utilised to extol the sacrificial ritual, the Vedic Suparṇa was identified with the son of the humiliated lady (?) in the popular tale and because

1. The tale is also called by the name 'Kusum-obampā'; for the tale see —'Parker—' Village folk-tales from Ceylon' (London, 1910). See also 'White turtly' in the same book.

2. It is current in the South. There was also a picture of that name produced somewhere during 1941-42. The same tale was filmed later in Hindi by Gemini Production by the name 'Bahut din huye'.

of the influence of the word 'Suparṇa', the lady (?) was named as 'Suparṇī', her sons 'Sauparṇānī' or 'Sauparṇeyāḥ' (the metres) performing the same great deed as sons in popular tales would perform, here the bringing of immortality or Soma (the most valued drink at the sacrifice), which was quite the same deed mentioned of Śyena-suparṇa in the R̥gveda. Thus a complete fusion of a popular tale with the R̥gvedic idea of *Somāharana* was accomplished against the background of the Brahmanic sacrificial ritual.

Who might these contesting co-wives originally be? We have seen how the text interprets 'Suparṇī' as the Vāk. This seems to be a later thought to suit her as the mother of the 'mantras'. There appears to be no relation whatsoever between the word "*Suparṇī*" and '*speech*'. The other identification viz. Suparṇī is the Heaven, is also feeble; for here again the word Suparṇī has no relation whatsoever with the sky or Heaven. The identification seems to be influenced by the identification of Kadrū with the Earth. The Earth and Heaven always forming a pair (cf. 'dyāvā-prthivya'), the rival of Kadrū (the Earth) came to be the Heaven at the time of the Brāhmaṇas. But, significant in this context is the epithet 'Śungī' as we have noted, which has been neglected by Jaul Charpentier and Vogel who follows him. 'Śungī' means the '*Nyagrodha*' (or the Indian fig tree, '*Ficus Indica*'). *Sungī* (or *Sungā*) is another epithet of Vinatā who is also called Suparṇī. The Nyagrodha is itself called '*Suparṇa*' in the Rāmāyaṇa,<sup>1</sup> the branch of this tree is called '*Parṇa-bahulā*'<sup>2</sup> (full with leaves) suggesting thereby the epithet '*Suparṇī*'. It is interesting to note that Garuḍa—the son of Vinatā (*Suparṇī* or *Sungī*) according to the Suparṇā-dhyāya—perched on the branch of this particular tree to eat the elephant and the tortoise.<sup>3</sup> Garuḍa is said to have killed

1. Rāmāyaṇa—III-35-36 (Mylapore-1958)

.....सुपर्णकृतलक्षणम् । नाम्ना सुभद्रं न्यग्रोधं.....'

2. Ibid-35-30.

3. Cf. Ibid-35-27 ff. Mb. (BORI)—I-25-40 ff. (where we have 'Rauhīṇa' which also means the Nyagrodha; Cf. also—Skanda p. III-38-60 ff. Padma p. V-44-38 ff. The Padma-Purāṇa has Garuḍa sitting on the branch of a

the Nīṣādas with the branch of this particular tree<sup>1</sup> This constant association of Garuḍa whose first mention as the son of *Suparṇī* or *Sungī* occurs in the 'Suparṇādhyaṃ' seems to have significance. This tree—i. e. *Sungā* (or *Sungī* or the Nyagrodha) is said to be the usual haunt of the huge birds called Garuḍa.<sup>2</sup> Now this big tree being the chosen haunt of the birds called Garuḍa might rightly be spoken of as their mother as is hinted first by the 'Suparṇādhyaṃ' and followed by the Mb. and the Purāṇas. The Earth could very well be taken as the mother of the serpents as they actually live in the holes or ant-hills in the Earth and issue forth from it.<sup>3</sup> The mother of the serpents being also called '*Surasā*'<sup>4</sup> who is identified with 'Kālā', supports this. If this is acceptable, the next step is easy. The serpents living in the earth under the huge tree, and the garuḍa bird upon the huge tree, would naturally come in folk-lore as rivals as would also the Earth and the Tree. This idea of rivalry can well be expected to get itself attached to the popular tales of wager. The principle of *animism*<sup>5</sup> peculiar to the *savage tribes*, according to which all things are supposed to have life, and on the same level as man would naturally have these two—the Earth and the Tree—come in folk-lore as real persons. Once this is understood, we can also understand how the *Sungā* is called *Suparṇī* with its beautiful leaves! This tree could naturally be called *Vinatā* in both the senses of the word, viz.—(i) *Vi + natā*, i. e. bent by the birds; and (ii)—'*Viśvaṇa natā*. The second mean-

---

Jambu-tree but ultimately Viṣṇu asks him to sit on his arm which Garuḍa does to eat his prey. Nyagrodha is also one of the epithets of Viṣṇu. This might have caused the change from Nyagrodha-Śākhā to Viṣṇu's arm.

1. Rāmāyaṇa—III-35-33.

2. For this see the episode of Śaktideva in the Kathā-Sarit-sāgara (see also *Die Suparnasage*, p. 363 ff.)

3. In ancient Egypt the serpent was called the son of the Earth for which see Vogel—'The Indian serpent lore', p. 20 Introduction.

4. Cf. Rām.—V-1-146; 158.

5. This is the underlying principle in Totemism where the totem and the human being are said to be on the same level.



ing is appropriate; for the off-shoots of the *Sungā* (*Nyagrodha*)<sup>1</sup> go down in the earth. If we take into account the natural and traditional rivalry between the serpents and the bird named *Garuḍa*, it will be easier still to understand this peculiar tale of rivalry and wager between these two—the Earth and the *Śungī* tree. It could be, thus, clear that the original party in rivalry with *Kadrū* was this tree called 'Śungī', and that 'Suparṇī' (or later 'Vinatā') were only epithets which gained prominence leaving away the proper name, when the original popular tale of the traditional rivalry of the *Garuḍas* and the *Nāgas* was cast into the Brahmanical atmosphere.

There is another very interesting episode which again hints at the association of the serpents with the *Nyagrodha* (*Śungā*). It occurs in the context of the death of King *Parikṣita*.<sup>2</sup> According to it when *Takṣaka* goes to bite the king to death, he meets a *Brāhmaṇa* by name *Kāśyapa* who also is on the way to the capital. On being asked the purpose of his visit to the capital, the *Brāhmaṇa* says that he would revive the king to life when *Takṣaka* bit him. Now *Takṣaka* asks him to show his power. In the challenge it happens that *Takṣaka* destroys a tree by his venom and the *Brāhmaṇa* *Kāśyapa* revives the tree. The tree is the *Nyagrodha*. When any other tree or object would have been sufficient for this demonstration of powers, it seems of particular importance that this '*Nyagrodha*' could have been chosen. It thus seems that in the context of the *Nāga-Garuḍa*-lore this tree *Śungā* or *Nyagrodha* has great importance; and it is with this peculiar importance that the tree comes in our tale of the wager as the mother of *Garuḍa*, as does *Kadrū* as that of the serpents.

I have propounded elsewhere<sup>3</sup> that *Garuḍa* and the *Nāgas* (serpents) were not different tribes as Oldham, Hastings, Vogel

---

1. The word *Nyagrodha* also mean 'shooting downwards' from *nyak*+*rudh* (to grow).

2. Cf. Mb. I-48.

3 In my article '*Garuḍas—An Ethnic study*' to be published in due course of time.

and others believe. They were two phratries of the same big clan, the Nāgas. Ethnically they were of the same stock. It is usual in the tribal organizations to have a definite symbol for each phratry.<sup>1</sup> Judging from the peculiar association of Garuḍa with the Śungā (Nyagrodha), it would not be wrong to propound that this particular tree might have been a special symbol of the Garuḍa phratry of the Nāga tribe (or the Nāga clan).

When we understand this nature of Kadrū and Vinatā, we can follow how the wager about the tale of the sun-horse suits in this context. The Rāmāyaṇa actually gives the location of the Nyagrodha with the whole exploit of Garuḍa related in a nutshell in the context of the description of Mārīca's hermitage. The great tree stands on the shore of the sea.<sup>2</sup> The Mahābhārata also has the same sea-shore situation of the tree; for according to it, Garuḍa goes to the trees and among them the 'Nauhiṇa' (i. e. Nyagrodha.) which are all in the vicinity of the sea.<sup>3</sup> The whole tale about Vinatā and Kadrū has the sea-background.<sup>4</sup> Garuḍa is said to go to meet his mother Vinatā on the shore of the sea.<sup>5</sup> Kadrū asks Vinatā (defeated in the wager) to take her on her back to the island Rāmaṇīyakam,<sup>6</sup> which is surrounded by sea-water. They both are said to come to the sea to look at the tail of the sun's horse<sup>7</sup>—the sea which is the abode of the Nāgas. Now it is well supported by textual proof that the tropic along the sea-shore and the islands in the

---

1. For which see Hild 'Mahābhārata' (London-1936), p. 122; 172. also Hastings 'Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics', p. 513. also Harris Wilder and Bert Wentforth, 'Personal Identification' (Boston-1918), p. 22 & 23.

2. Rām. III-35-36 and 37.

3. Mb. (BORI)-I-25-40ff.

4. Ibid-I-22; I-25.

5. Ibid-I-21.

6. For the exact location of Rāmaṇīyakam see my article in 'Purāṇa'. Vol. III-No. 1-Jan. 1961.

7. Mb. I-20.

bay of Bengal (called *Mahodadhi*)<sup>1</sup> were the colonies of the Nāgas. Now, the Nyagiodha (the *śuṅgī* of our tale) and the Earth, both symbols of the Nāga phratries<sup>2</sup>, could look upon *the sun beyond the ocean* and have a wager. The sun playing an important part in the wager can be understood, if we remember that most of the ancient tribes were having sun-worship; that the original cult was generally the sun-cult and later it gave place to the worship of warrior gods.<sup>3</sup> The reference to the Sun in this wager seems to be an influence from such ancient belief. It is for this reason, most probably, that Garuḍa is said to go to the East according to the 'Suparṇādhāya',<sup>4</sup> and Vinatā is said to be 'Pataṅgī' as the sun is the 'Pataṅga' in the Skanda Purāṇa<sup>5</sup>. Aruṇa being the deformed son of Vinatā and being the charioteer of the Sun, also hints at the same point. This seems to be the original nature of Kadrū, Vinatā and their peculiar wager. In all probability this tale of the wager formed a part of the traditional lore of the Nāgas and other people, and was current all over the land. At the period of the Brāhmaṇas it was assimilated into the sacrificial ritual and was fashioned to suit their own purpose as we have hinted before and as can be clearly seen from such passages as —

"What she (Kadrū) spoke as 'beyond water', it is only the sacrificial altar she spoke of. 'The white horse rests on the pillar i.e. the sacrificial post is that pillar; Agni is the white horse. As to what Kadrū said, 'Down' hangs the tale of that horse—the wind shakes it—that I see'; it is only the cord (fastened to the sacrificial post) that she spoke of."<sup>6</sup>

1. For which see my article mentioned above in note 30; also Mukherji 'Ancient India'—(Allahabad, 1956) map opp p 484.

2. See-Hastings—Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics-Vol. ii. p. 417 for the tree of Banyan as having the spirit of the Nāga-Rāja.

3. On this point see W. J. Perry's beautiful article 'The coming of Warriors' in 'Making of Man'—(New York, 1931).

4. Suparṇādhāya-VII-14-4 (in 'Die Suparnasage'. J. Charpentier.).

5. Skanda P-IV-50-33

6. Śatapatha Br (Kāṇva) V-6-2 5 and 6.

‘सा यदुवाचास्य सलिलस्य परस्तादिति वेदिं ह्येव तदुवाच.....अश्वः स्वेतः

It should not be argued here that the wager of Kadrū and Suparṇī was part of Vedic symbolism for the Earth and the Sky; for, as we have noticed, 'Suparṇī' is not to be found in the R̥gveda and even in the later Vedic texts there is no one interpretation of the name—sometimes being 'Vāk' and sometimes 'Heaven'. Moreover, Kādraveya being the king of a definite clan, the 'sarpaś'—who had '*Sarpavidyā*' as the specific lore as mentioned in the Śānta Sūtras<sup>1</sup> and the Śatapatha Br.<sup>2</sup> nullifies this symbolism, indicating that there was a definite phratry of the sarpaś (later completely identified with Nāgas) named after Kadrū (whence the chief of the phratry is Kādraveya). The names '*Kādraveyāḥ*' (for Nāgas) and '*Vainateya*' or '*Saungeya*' for Garuḍa also fit in well in the maternal nature of the tribal organizations. Kaśyapa being the common husband for these two, i. e. Kadrū and Vinatā—need not surprise us; for the tortoise (or Kacchapa) (along with the snake) was considered to be the common fore-father of all the tribes in India.<sup>3</sup> It is possible that this 'Kacchapa' was later identified with the Kaśyapa Prajāpati. Hence also that the various clans—viz., the birds, the serpents etc. are said to be produced by Kaśyapa. The tortoise is clearly mentioned to be earlier even than the Prajāpati.<sup>4</sup>

रक्षणां सेवत इति द्यूः रक्षागुग्निः स्वः रवेतः । तद्ध तदुवाच तस्याश्चस्य वालो न्ययिष्ठिज्,  
इति तमसुं वत आधुनोति, इति तमसुं पद्यामोति यत् कद्रूवाच रक्षणां ह्येव तदुवाच ।

1. See Āśvalayana Śr. Śā. Uttara Saṅka-IV-6 1

Śukthyayana Śr. Śā. XVI-2-13 and 14.

2. Ś. Br.-(Mādhyandina)-XIII-4-3-9.

See also Aitareya Br. VI.1 where Arbuda Kādraveya is referred to as a 'Sarparsi' who helps also to drive the sacrificial evil which the other 'hotra' could not. In the Taittirīya Saṁhitā-(1-5-4) we have another Kādraveya by name Kaśyapa, also a Sarpa-seer.

3. See Review on Risley's 'Tribes and Castes of Bengal'—JRAS-1883.

4. Cf. Taittirīya Āraṇyaka-I-28-1.

# THE FOUR WORLD OCEANS AND THE DVĪPA THEORY OF THE MIDDLE AGES

By

B. H. KAPADIA

[ चतुर्णां द्वीपानां विषये मध्ययुगीयो विचारोऽत्र प्रस्तुतः । 'चत्वारो महाद्वीपाः' इति मतं प्राचीनभारतीयवाङ्मये प्रावर्तत । एतन्मतं तु वैदिकवाङ्मयस्य चतसृणां महानदीनां वर्णनमाश्रित्य प्रचारं लेभे । बौद्धवाङ्मयेऽपि चत्वार एव द्वीपाः स्वीकृताः, तेषां नामानि च जम्बुद्वीपः, पूर्वविदेहः, अपरगोदानीयः, उत्तरकुक्ष्येति तत्र तत्र ललितविस्तरप्रभृतिषु बौद्धग्रन्थेषु प्रसिद्धाः । जातककथासु गाथासु च चत्वारो द्वीपास्तेषां नामानि चानेनैव क्रमेण प्राप्यन्ते । सुमेरुमण्डित इमे द्वीपाः स्थिता इति च मतमपि तत्र वर्तते । महाभारते पुराणे च सप्तद्वीपवर्णनस्यैव प्राधान्यं विद्यते । सप्तद्वीपवर्णनेन सह वर्षवर्णनमपि तत्रोपलभ्यते । मेरुपार्व्वेषु स्थिताश्चत्वारो द्वीपाः—भद्राश्वः, केतुमालः, जम्बुद्वीपः, उत्तराः कुरवश्च अपि तत्र प्रोक्ताः । वर्षविषयकविचारस्थलेषु मेरुर्जम्बुद्वीपमध्यवर्ती पर्वतः, तथा भद्राश्वः, केतुमालः, उत्तराः कुरवश्च जम्बुद्वीपान्तर्गतानि वर्षाणीत्युक्तम् । वायुपुराणे वराहपुराणे च 'द्वीप'स्थाने 'देशाः' 'जम्बुद्वीप'स्थाने च 'भारतम्' इति प्रोक्तम् । विष्णुपुराणे भागवतपुराणे चापि द्वीपानां वर्षाणां च वर्णनमुपलभ्यते । ]

It is quite probable, that in the Vedic description of the four world-rivers lies the germ of the remarkable Dvīpa-theory of the middle ages. The earth surrounded by the waters of the ocean may be thought of as a round orb or as a square being interlaced by four rivers going out from the middle point of the earth thus giving rise to four rings of water inundating the tract of land and thus giving rise to what is exactly meant by the word DVĪPA. But, in any case, the number of Dvīpas in later days change and the description of the four Dvīpas lying encircling the mountain Meru appears to be the oldest. The Buddhists have taken over this theory in this form and adhered to it in all their schools and they have partly added

smaller dvīpas and the pratyantaradvīpas. From these the real dvīpas can be separated as the Mahādvīpas.

In the prose of the Mandhātujātaka (2. 313.7) it is said that king Mandhātu had enjoyed sovereignty over the four Mahādvīpas.<sup>1</sup> The same is only narrated in greater detail in the Māndhātavadāna of Divyāvadāna (214) and here the names of the four Dvīpas are also given as Jambudvīpa, Pūrvavideha, Aparagodānīya and Uttarakuru. Similar names are mentioned in Lalitavistara<sup>2</sup> (19.15f.) and the same list of the dvīpas or the mahādvīpas is repeated in the Mahāvastu.<sup>3</sup>

Huan-Tsang gives an exact account of the position of the Dvīpas. The four Dvīpas lie in the salt-ocean encircling Sumeru which is chiefly surrounded by seven mountains encircled by water, and indeed Pitiha (Videha) in the east, Chan-pu (Jambu) in the south, Ku-to-ni (Godānī) in the west, and Kou-lo (Kuru) in the north.

These numbers and the names are repeated again in the Jātaka books and in such Gāthās which can scarcely originate from Buddhistic authors. 'As far the four Dvīpas together with the oceans and together with the mountains stretch, so far reaches my tail. How can you avoid it?' So says the panther to the sheep in the Dipijātaka.<sup>4</sup> In the Vidhura-paṇḍitajātaka Vidhura tells Dhanañjaya as he shows him the wonderful gem, 'See the Videhas in the east and in the

1. चतुस्सु महादीपेसु. Along with it 2000 smaller islands are mentioned (द्विसहस्रदीपपरिवारेसु) ।

2. न बोधिसत्त्वाः प्रत्यन्तद्वीपेषूपपद्यन्ते...न पूर्वविदेहे नापरगोदानीये न चोत्तर-कुरौ । अथ तर्हि जम्बुद्वीप एवोपपद्यन्ते । likewise 149. 19f. (however गोदानीय instead of अपरगोदानीय) as the constituent of the चतुर्द्वीपक लोकधातु. The same names are mentioned in a chapter beginning with चतुर्द्वीपको लोकधातु in Mahāvastu 154.

3. cf. I. 49. 6 ; II. 68. 6. 1 f ; II. 58. 18f. ; III. 378 1f. ; in the last two passages the western Dvīpa is called अपरगोदानिकम् ।

4. 426, G. 4 : यावता चतुरो द्वीपा ससमुद्रा सपञ्चता ।

तावता महा नहुष्यं कथं खो त्वं विवज्जयि ॥

west the Goyānīyas, the Kuru and the Jambudvīpa embedded in the stone'.<sup>6</sup>

In the Mahābhārata and in the Purāṇas<sup>6</sup> rules sovereign the description of the seven Dvīpas which must have quite distinct source than the description of the four Dvīpas. By the side of this there occurs the Varṣa-theory, according to which the Jambudvīpa is split asunder by inaccessible different parallel strips of mountains and in the midst of the middlemost strip lies the mountain Meru. Nevertheless, the old dvīpa-theory which is completely unreconcilable with this, always breaks through it. In Mbh. 6-6, in a chapter, which contains the description of the Jambudvīpa after the Varṣa inserts a verse 12 when it comes to the talk of the mountain Meru, "On its sides are lying these four dvīpas, O king, Bhadrāśva, Ketumāla. Jambudvīpa and these Uttarakurus. O Bhārata, they serve as the resort for those who have earned merit".<sup>7</sup> In the present context, the Varṣa is completely insensible. According to the Varṣa-theory Meru lies in the centre of Jambudvīpa, Uttarakuru is the Northern Varṣa, and Bhadrāśva and Ketumāla are the two side-Varṣas of the central strip east and west from Meru. The Vāyu Purāṇa and the Varāha Purāṇa contain a compilation of the Jambudvīpakhaṇḍavinirmāṇa of the Mbh. Here the scandalous dvīpas are substituted by Deśāḥ and for Jambudvīpa, Bhārata is substituted as the name of the Northernmost Varṣa.<sup>8</sup>

5. 545, G, 74 : पुरतो विदेहे पस्स गोयानिये च पच्छतो ।

कुर्यो जम्बुद्वीपांश्च मणिम्ह पस्स निम्मितम् ॥

6. cf. मत्स्यपुराण, अध्याय 113-114 ; In almost all the Mahā Purāṇas the descriptions of 7 dvīpas, 7 oceans, Meru and the Varṣas is identical. The description of Vāyu Purāṇa is with details. Also found in the भीष्मपर्व of the Mbh. महाभारत 12. 14. 21 ; Vāyu, Matsya, Mārkaṇḍeya, Kūrma, Liṅga have identical phraseology.

7. तस्य पार्श्वेष्वमी द्वीपाश्चत्वारः संस्थिता विभो । भद्राश्वः केतुमालश्च जम्बुद्वीपश्च भारत उत्तराश्चैव कुरुवः कृतपुरयप्रतिश्रयाः ।

8. Vāyu Purāṇa 34. 56ff, Var. p. 75. 57ff :

चत्वारो यस्य देशा वै (Var: देशास्तु) नानापार्श्वेष्वविष्टिताः । भद्राश्वो भारत-

A further support of the original, which is wanting in the Mbh. is the oft repeated comparison which occurs in many Purāṇas, of Meru and the encircling four dvīpas with the receptacle and the leaves of the lotus. Vāyu Purāṇa 34. 46 states : "It is well-known that the four big dvīpas have the form of the leaves and the mighty Meru, the form of the receptacle".<sup>9</sup> In Varāhapurāṇa (75. 48) this text standing by all means in flagrant contrast to the Varṣa-theory is changed and the result is pure nonsense.<sup>10</sup> Encouraging is the Viṣṇu Purāṇa II. 2. 37 f., where omitting the word dvīpa and inserting the word Bhārata for Jambudvīpa-with it is said : "From Nīla to Niṣadha Mālyavat and Gandhamādana stretch themselves. In their centre lies Meru which has the form of the receptacle. Bhārata, Ketumāla, Bhadrāśva and the Kurus are the leaves of the world lotus".<sup>11</sup>

Even in Vāyu P. 42, where there is the description of the course of the four world rivers, always the ancient description peeps through. There is no talk of the Varṣas which must be watered by the rivers in their course.<sup>12</sup> The Sītā

---

(Vāy. ३०) रश्मैव केतुमालश्च पश्चिमः (Var. ० मे) उत्तरः (Var. ० रे) कुरवश्चैव कुतः  
पुण्यप्रतिश्रयाः ।

Both the last lines occur again in the Vāyu P. 41, 85 in the form :

भद्राश्च भारतश्चैव केतुमालश्च पश्चिमाः ।

उत्तराः कुरवश्चैव कुतपुण्यप्रतिश्रयाः ॥

But the line going before it runs here :

चत्वारो नैकवर्णाद्व्या महाद्वीपाः परिभ्रुताः ।

९. महाद्वीपास्तु विख्याताश्चत्वारः पत्रसंस्थिताः ।

ततः कर्णिकासंस्थानो मेरुर्नमि महाबलः ॥

१०. महावर्षाणि व्यातानि चत्वार्येव च संस्थिताः ।

तत्र पर्वतसंस्थानो मेरुर्नमि महाबलः ॥

११. आनीलनिषवायामौ माल्यवद्गन्धमादनौ ।

तयोर्मध्यगतो मेरुः कर्णिकाकारसंस्थितः ।

भारताः केतुमालाश्च भद्राश्चैव कुरवस्तथा ।

पत्राणि लोकेष्वस्य ..... ।

१२. Only in V. 67 Nīla is once mentioned as the Varṣaparvata.



flows through Bhadrāśva which is mentioned as a great dvīpa.<sup>13</sup> Likewise, the western river waters the Mahādvīpa Ketumāla<sup>14</sup> and the Bhadrāsoma the Mahādvīpa Uttarakuru.<sup>15</sup> At the end of the ch. (v. 98) the earth is expressly designated as चतुर्माह्वीपवती<sup>16</sup>.

As a matter of fact, the ancient Brahmanic conception exactly agrees with the Buddhistic. Bhadrāśva, Ketumāla and Uttarakuru were dvīpas before they became Varṣas inside the Jambudvīpa. Only in the name of the four dvīpas there is difference and it must be understood that Pūrvavideha makes an ancient impression than Bhadrāśva. So long however Godāniya, the name of the western dvīpa with the Buddhists, is not made clear according to its origin, one can hardly opine about it with any degree of certainty.

13. भद्राश्वं सा (स) महाद्वीपं प्लावयन्ती वरापगा  
प्रविष्टा क्षणं पूर्वं पूर्वं द्वीपे महानदी ॥२४॥ cf. वायु 42 39-41.

14. केतुमालं महाद्वीपं नानाम्लेच्छगणैर्युतम् ।  
प्लावयन्ती महाभामा प्रयाता पश्चिमार्णवम् ॥२७॥

15. प्लावयन्ती प्रमुदिता उत्तरान् सा कुरुन् शिवा ।  
महाद्वीपस्य मध्येन प्रयाता सीतरार्णवम् ॥७७॥

16. How deep the description of the four dvīpas has taken root in the conscience of the Indians is shown in the talk of Draupadi who infuriates the dejected Yudhisṭhira to manly resolution. She describes to him his victory over the four dvīpas whose names, with the exception of Bhadrāśva, are taken from the list of the seven dvīpas. Only towards the end are spoken of the antardvīpas quite generally (Mbh. 12 14. 21ff) —

जम्बुद्वीपो महाराज नानाजनपदैर्युतः ।  
त्वया पुत्रपशूनां दण्डेन मुदितः प्रभो ॥२१॥  
जम्बुद्वीपेन सहस्रः क्रौञ्चद्वीपो नराधिप ।  
अधरेण महामेरोर्दण्डेन मुदितस्त्वया ॥२२॥  
क्रौञ्चद्वीपेन सहस्रः शाकद्वीपो नराधिप ।  
पूर्वेण तु महामेरोर्दण्डेन मुदितस्त्वया ॥२३॥  
उत्तरेण महामेरोः शाकद्वीपेन सम्मितः ।  
भद्राश्वः पुत्रपशूनां दण्डेन मुदितस्त्वया ॥२४॥  
द्वीपाश्च सान्तर्द्वीपा नानाजनपदाश्चयाः ।  
विगाह्य सागरं वीर दण्डेन मुदितास्त्वया ॥२५॥

If the conjecture, about the origin of the theory regarding the four dvīpas from the Vedic division of the earth through the four rivers is correct, then the Vedic, in course of time, must have made a change at least in two points. First, the rivers must have become the oceans. In any case, the Buddhists think of the four dvīpas to be surrounded by the oceans and even in the Brahmanic cosmology the same must have been the case, even though that does not occur in the Purāṇas where the ancient dvīpas have become the vaiṣṇas of Jambudvīpa. The assumption of such a formation of rivers into oceans does not land us into any great difficulty. It may be even possible even in the time of the Rg-veda if one were to understand the expression तस्याः समुद्रा अबि विसरन्ति I. 164. 42 quite literally. The above given conception appears to be more probable

Secondly, the position of the four Dvīpas must be somewhat shifted, presupposing that one thinks the four rivers to be originally turned towards the four main directions, then the islands naturally must lie in between the intermediary directions. If, on the other hand, the direction of the rivers as is given to us by the Buddhists be more ancient, then the exact location of the Dvīpas from the beginning must be the same. As regards the expression प्रदिशः in I. 164. 42 on behalf of the second assumption, one ought not to call in question, since प्रदिशः in the more ancient language is employed undoubtedly in the sense of the principal direction.

Before I pass on further, I express my hearty obligation to the late lamented Heinrich Ludeis, the great scholar of the Sanskrit language, for having used his discussion given in the article entitled "Die vier Weltsrome und die Dvīpa-theory des Mittelalters".

The sixth Upāṅga (Uvaṅga) of the canonical literature of the Śvetāmbara Jainas is Jambudvīpaprājñapti (Jambudivapannati). It contains the description of Jambudvīpa or India. It is a work on Jaina Cosmology divided into seven sections. In the third section there is the description of the Bhāratavaṣa.

The treatise speaks of the seven *Varṣas* or countries constituting the seven main divisions of *Jambudvīpa*. According to Leumann (ZDMG Vols. 48 and 82) they can be called as exactly parallel texts to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* II and the *Bhāgavata* *Purāṇa* V. The *Bhāratavarṣa* appears as the bedstead from the north, and from the south as the bow. The two great rivers *Gaṅgā* and the *Sindhu* and the mountain *Vaitādhya* (*Vindhya*) divides into six portions. The text states that there are six *Varṣa Parvatas*<sup>17</sup> in the *Jambudvīpa* viz. *Himavān*, *Hemakūta*, *Niṣadha*, *Nīla*, *Śveta* and *Śṛṅgavān*, from the south to the north. Each one forms a long range from sea to sea. The *Jambudvīpa* connects the origin of the river *Ganges* with a flow through the eastern outlet of a great lake in the lesser Himalayan range. Like the lotus lake, the lake *Anottara*, has four outlets on the four sides from each of which flows a river. The four rivers that flow from the four outlets are *Gaṅgā*, *Rohitā*, *Sindhu* and *Harikāntā* (*Jamb.* 4. 34. 35). Many rivers fall into the *Ganges* through which they enter the eastern ocean. The text speaks of 8 peaks of the greater Himalaya, 11 of the lesser range and 9 of the *Vaitādhya* range.

The *Nandī sūtra* and the *Anuyogadvāra* are counted among the *Prakīraṇas* but they stand as two companion texts forming a group by themselves. These books are a storehouse of information. The Buddhists recognise five big rivers (महानदियो) : *Gaṅgā*, *Yamunā*, *Acirāvati*, *Sarabha*, *Muhī* (*Mil.* 70. 87. 380). *Mil.* 114 states that from among the 500 rivers flowing from *Himavat* only ten are to be reckoned as rivers as they were always full of water. Besides the above mentioned there are *Sindhu*, *Sarasvatī*, *Vettavatī*, *Vitāṃsā* and *Candabhāgā*.

---

17. cf. *Mataya* P. 113. 10; *Vāyu* P. 34. 13, 21; 49. 52-53 where six *Varṣaparyatas* of *Jambudvīpa* are *Himavān*, *Hemakūta*, *Niṣadha*, *Meru*, *Nīla* and *Śṛṅgavān*. They are served by *Siddhas* and *Cāraṇas*. Their inner *Viṣkambha* is 9,000.

## सम्भवैतिह्यविचारः

पं० अनन्तशास्त्री फडके

[The Naiyāyikas recognise only the four *pramāṇas* or instruments of right knowledge, viz. *pratyakṣa* (perception), *anumāna* (inference), *upamāna* (analogy) and *āgama* (word of the trustworthy). The Paurāṇikas add two more, viz. *sambhava*, (equivalence) and *aitihya* (tradition). The Naiyāyikas, however, do not recognise these two *pramāṇas* of the Paurāṇikas as separate *pramāṇas*; they include *sambhava* in the *anumāna*, and *aitihya* in the *āgama*. The learned writer here discusses this problem and supports the view of the Paurāṇikas in holding and establishing the *sambhava* and *aitihya* as distinct from *anumāna* and *āgama*].

प्रमाणसंख्यानिर्णयप्रसङ्गे प्रामाणिकैः पौराणिकानां मते सम्भवैतिह्यप्रमाण-  
योरस्तित्वमङ्गीकृत्य तयोः प्रमाणान्तरत्वं खण्डयित्वा प्रसिद्धयोरनुमानागमप्रमाण-  
योरन्तर्भावः कृत इति सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुद्यां, दीपिकाटीकानीलकण्ठ्यां, अन्यत्र च  
प्रसिद्धमेतत् । तथा हि-‘संभवैतिह्ययोरतिरिक्तप्रमाणत्वं वदतां पौराणिकानां  
मतं दूषयति ‘शते पञ्चाशदित्यादिने’ति तर्कसंग्रहः, शब्दखण्डम्, दीपिकाटीका-  
नीलकण्ठी । खण्डनप्रकारस्तु “संभवस्तु खार्या द्रोणादकप्रस्थाद्यवगमः । स  
चानुमानमेव, खारित्वं हि द्रोणाद्यविनाभूतं प्रतीतं खार्या द्रोणादिसत्त्वमवगमयति”  
इति सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी । प्रशस्तपादभाष्येऽपि सम्भवोऽप्यविनाभावित्वाद्-  
नुमानमेव इति । “शतवानित्युक्ते पञ्चाशद्वानिति ज्ञानं संभवति तस्यानु-  
मानेनैव निर्वाहात् शतस्य पञ्चाशद्व्याप्यत्वादितिभावः” ( इति नीलकण्ठीटीका )  
एवं च संभवस्थलेऽविनाभावस्य व्याप्यव्यापकभावस्य वा विद्यमानत्वेन संभव-  
प्रमाणस्यानुमानेऽन्तर्भावो न तु तस्य प्रमाणान्तरत्वमिति ।

एवमैतिह्यप्रमाणविषये “यच्चानिर्दिष्टप्रवक्तृकं प्रवादपारम्पर्यमात्रम् । ‘इति  
होतुर्वृद्धाः’ इत्यैतिह्यं, यथा ‘इह वटे यक्षः प्रतिवसति’ इति न तत्प्रमाणमनिर्दिष्ट-

प्रवक्तृकत्वेन सांशयिकत्वात् । आसवक्तृकत्वनिश्चये त्वागम एव” इति सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुद्यां श्री वाचस्पतिमिश्राः । प्रशस्तपादभाष्येऽपि “ऐतिह्यमप्यवितथ-मासोपदेश एव” इति । एवञ्चैतिह्यस्य उपदेशरूपत्वेन तस्यासोपदेशत्वे शब्दप्रमाणेऽन्तर्भावः आसोपदेशत्वाभावेऽप्रमाणत्वमेवेति ।

परन्तु विषयेऽस्मिन् पुराणेषु तद्व्याख्यातृभिश्च किं प्रतिपादितम् तदपि समालोचनीयकोटिमाटीकते—

लिङ्गपुराणे—आगमादनुमानाच्च प्रत्यक्षादुपपत्तितः ।

परीक्ष्य निपुणं भक्त्या श्रद्धातव्यं विषश्चिता ॥ ( ६१।६१ )

एवं वायुपुराणेऽपि ( ५३।१२३ ) श्लोकोऽयमेतयैवानुपूर्वोपलभ्यते । अत्रागम-अनुमान-प्रत्यक्षरूपप्रमाणत्रयं तु सर्वप्रसिद्धमेव स्वीकृतमस्ति । उपपत्ति-रूपपदं केवलं शङ्कास्पदम् । केचनोपपत्तिपदेनार्थापत्तेर्ग्रहणं मन्वते । अस्माकं मते तूपपत्तिपदेन संभवस्य ग्रहणं विवक्षितमस्ति । अर्थापत्तादुपपाद्यं प्रमाणकोटौ आस्ते, उपपादकं तु प्रमेयकोटाविति पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न मुञ्क्ते इत्याद्युदाहरणे तदुपपादनप्रकरणे च सुस्पष्टम् । पौराणिकाङ्गीकृते संभवप्रमाणे-उपपादकांशः विद्यते । क्वचित्स व्याप्यव्यापकरूपेण क्वचिद्विनाभावरूपेण क्वचिच्च काल्पनिकरूपेण वा अस्तीत्यन्यदेतत् । तथा हि प्रसिद्धालङ्कारिक-दार्शनिकैरप्ययदीक्षितैः कुवलयानन्दे संभवस्यानुमानात्ममाणान्तरत्वमङ्गीकृत्य संभवप्रमाणरूपालंकारप्रदर्शनार्थमुदाहरणत्रयं प्रदत्तम् । तथा हि—

अमृतपूर्वं मम भावि किं वा सर्वं सहे मे सहजं हि दुःखम् ।’

अत्र कथंचित्-यत्र यत्र जन्मना सहजातदुःखसंभावना तत्र तत्र अमृतपूर्वस्य भाविनो वा दुःखस्य संप्राप्तिसंभावनापीति व्याप्यव्यापकभावोऽविनाभावो वा कल्पयितुं शक्येत, उपपादकं च सहजातदुःखसत्त्वमिति च ।

द्वितीयमुदाहरणम्—

ये नाम केचिदिह नः प्रथयन्त्यवज्ञां  
जानन्ति ते किमपि तान्प्रति नैप यतः ।

उत्पत्स्यतेऽस्ति मम कोऽपि समानधर्मा  
कालो ह्ययं निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी ॥

अत्र यत्र यत्र तत्कालिककृतकाव्यादिविषयकतिरस्कारजनकत्वेन काव्यकर्तुस्तत्कालिकतिरस्कारकर्तृणां कृते काव्यनिर्माणाभावः, तत्र तत्र काव्यादि-मर्मविदुत्पस्यमानः अथवाऽन्यत्र विद्यमानः इत्यादिरूपो व्याप्यव्यापकभावोऽविनाभावो वा कल्पयितुं न शक्यते, अनुपसंहारिरूपहेत्वाभासप्रस्तत्वात् । परन्तु संभवप्रमाणरूपालंकारस्त्वत्र घटते एव । यतः संभवो नाम-उपपादकसहितसंभाव्ये-च्छाप्रदर्शनम् । तत्त्वत्र 'कालो ह्ययं निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी' इत्युपपादकसहितं 'उत्पत्स्यतेऽस्ति मम कोऽपि समानधर्मा', इतीच्छाप्रदर्शनं कृतमस्ति ।

अतः श्रीमद्भिरप्पयदीक्षितैरुदाहरणविवरणप्रसंगे 'अत्राद्योदाहरणे अभूतपूर्वं मम भावि किं वेति संभवप्रमाणासिद्धार्थो दर्शितः । द्वितीयोदाहरणे संभवोपपादकं कालानन्त्यादिकमपि प्रदर्शितमित्युक्तम् । एवं च संभवप्रमाणेऽविनाभावस्य व्याप्यव्यापकभावस्य वा सर्वत्र विद्यमानत्वाभावेनानुमानप्रमाणे न तस्यान्तर्भावः किन्तु प्रमाणान्तरं तदिति ।

संभवप्रमाणप्रमेयस्य बह्वन्युदाहरणानि भारते पुराणेषु चोपलभ्यन्ते, तथा हि-सावित्रीयमसंवादे सावित्र्याऽन्तिमवरेण स्वकृते शतपुत्रप्राप्तिः प्रार्थिता यमेन च सा वररूपेण प्रदत्ता, परन्तु सत्यवतो जीवनदानं विना तद्वरदानं व्यर्थमिति सावित्र्योक्ते यमेन सत्यवतो जीवनदानमपि स्वीकृतं तत्तथैव जातमपि ।

अत्र पतिव्रतार्थस्त्रीविषये यत्र यत्र पर्युर्मरणानन्तरं पुत्रोत्पत्तिदानवरस्तत्र तत्र पर्युर्जीवनदानमपि इति व्याप्यव्यापकभावोऽविनाभावो वा न कल्पयितुं शक्यते अनुपसंहारिरूपहेत्वाभासप्रस्तत्वात् । किञ्च विचित्रवीर्यक्षेत्रेषु पतिं विनापि पुत्रोत्पत्तेर्दर्शनेन नियोगस्य क्षत्रियादिषु धर्म्यरूपेण स्वीकृतत्वेन च तथा कल्पयितुमयोग्यम् । अत्र-संभवप्रमाण उपपादकसत्यवज्जीवनसहितसंभाव्यशत-पुत्रोत्पत्तीच्छाप्रदर्शनं इत्यस्त्येव ।

अत्र क्वचित्पुराणेषु प्रमाणानां विचार आयाति परन्तु तत्र श्लोकादिनिर्दिष्टानि यावन्त्येव प्रमाणानि तावन्त्येव पौराणिकानां मते प्रमाणानि ननु ततोऽधिकानीति न

मन्तव्यम् तत्प्रकरणस्य प्रमाणसंख्याननिर्धारणेऽप्रवृत्तत्वात् । किन्तु विश्वरे चेतसः प्रवर्ण-  
करणमेव तत्र तत्र प्रधानम् । अतएव परीक्ष्य निपुणं भक्त्या श्रद्धातव्यं विपश्चितेति  
तच्छ्लोक एव तत्र निर्दिष्टम् । एवं श्रीमद्भागवते ( ११।१९।१७ ) अपि—

श्रुतिः प्रत्यक्षमैतिह्यमनुमानचतुष्टयम् ।

प्रमाणेष्वनवस्थानाद्विकल्पात्स विरज्यते ॥ इत्युक्तमिति ।

लोके प्रसिद्धानां कथावतपदवाच्यानामपि 'होनहार विरवान के होत चीकनो-  
पात' इत्यादीनां कथंचित्संभवप्रमाणेऽन्तर्भावः कर्तुं शक्यते ।

ऐतिह्येतिहासशब्दौ 'इति-ह' एवं 'इति-ह-आस' इत्यव्ययसमुदायेन निष्पन्नौ ।  
तथा हि 'पारम्पर्योपदेशे स्यादैतिह्यमितिहास्यम्' इतिकोशात्परम्परासम्बद्धोपदेशार्थ-  
कादिहाव्ययसमुदायाद् 'नन्तावसथेतिहभेषजान्वयः' इति व्यप्रत्यये ऐतिह्यशब्दः  
साधुः एवं "इति-ह-आस" इत्यव्ययसमुदाये "आस" इति तिङ्विभक्त्यन्तप्रति-  
रूपकभासीदित्यर्थकमव्ययम् । "इतिहासं पुरातनम्" इत्यादिस्थलेषु प्राचीन-  
ऋष्याद्याचरितस्य वर्णनवदधुनिकशिष्टाचरितस्य दर्शनेन 'इदमवश्यं कर्त्तव्यम्'  
इति कर्त्तव्यकोटौ निवेशनप्रयोजकस्याचारस्यापि ग्रहणमुचितं प्रतिभाति ।  
ऐतिह्यप्रमाणस्य स्वरूपं खण्डनं च यत् प्रामाणिकग्रन्थेषूपलभ्यते तदप्यालोचनीयम्  
यच्चानिर्दिष्टप्रवक्तृकं प्रवादं पारम्पर्यमात्रम् इति होचुर्बुद्ध्याः इत्यैतिह्यम् यथा  
'इहवटे यक्षः प्रतिवसति' इति, न तत् प्रमाणं अनिर्दिष्टप्रवक्तृकत्वेन  
सांशयिकत्वात् । आप्तप्रवक्तृकत्वनिश्चये त्वागम एव इति सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुद्यां  
वाचस्पतिमिश्राः । प्रशस्तपादभाष्येऽपि "ऐतिह्यमप्यवितथमाप्तोपदेश एव  
इत्युक्तम् । अस्तु ।

पौराणिकैरत्र यदुक्तं तदपि समालोचनीयम् । श्रीमद्भागवते—

श्रुतिः प्रत्यक्षमैतिह्यमनुमानचतुष्टयम् ।

प्रमाणेष्वनवस्थानाद्विकल्पात्स विरज्यते ॥ ( ११।१९।१७ ) इत्युक्तम् ।

अत्र श्रुतिपदेनागमस्य ग्रहणम् प्रत्यक्षानुमाने तु कण्ठत एवोक्ते ।  
अत्र श्रुत्यपेक्षया ऐतिह्यस्य पृथग् ग्रहणं कुर्वता श्रीव्यासदेवेन श्रुतावैतिह्यस्यान्तर्भावो  
नाङ्गीक्रियत एवेति सुस्पष्टम् । ऐतिह्यपदस्य व्याख्यानं कुर्वता श्रीधराचार्येण

‘महाजनप्रसिद्धिः’ इति कृतम् । महाजनप्रसिद्धिरित्यनेन उपदेशशब्दरूपं शिष्टक्रियारूपं चोभयं गृह्यते । एवं च क्यारूपस्य शब्दे नान्तर्भावदैतिहं शब्दातिरिक्तं स्वतन्त्रमेव प्रमाणं प्रसिद्धयति । कर्मकाण्डे पदार्थस्थापनादिप्रसङ्गे विनोपदेशं गुरुकृतक्रियादिकं दृष्ट्वा तच्छिष्यपरम्परया कर्तव्यत्वेन तथैव आचर्यते । न तु तदप्रमाणं प्रत्युत विवाहादिकार्येषु स्त्रीभिः परमप्रमाणतयाऽत्यादरेण च विनापि शब्दोपदेशं तदाचर्यते । व्यवहारे श्वश्रून्पाक्रमेण तद्दृष्ट्वैव प्रमाणत्वेनांगीकृत्य समाचर्यते । एवं धर्मसम्बन्धरहिते आधुनिके व्यवहारे सभाप्रारम्भे अध्यक्षनिर्वाचनं तस्यानुमोदनमध्यक्षाय माल्यसमर्पणमन्तेराङ्गीत-गानमित्यादिव्यवहारकोटौ सर्वत्र दृश्यते, तद्विषये न सर्वत्र शब्दव्यवहारः किन्तु यद् महाजनप्रसिद्ध्या प्रमाणत्वेन स्वीकृत्य समाचर्यते तद् ऐतिह्यप्रमाण-बोध्यमेवेत्यङ्गीकर्तव्यम् ।

प्रसिद्धदार्शनिकालंकारिकाप्ययदीक्षितैरपि श्रुतिप्रमाणालंकाराद् भिन्नतया ऐतिह्यप्रमाणालंकारं प्रदर्शयद्भिः—

कल्याणी वत गाथेयं लौकिकी प्रतिभाति मे ।

एति जीवन्तमानन्दो नरं वर्षशतादपि ॥

इत्युदाहरणं प्रदर्श्य ‘अत्र लौकिकी गाथेयमित्यनिर्दिष्टप्रवक्तृकप्रवाद-पारम्पर्यरूपता दर्शितेत्युक्तम् । अनेन श्रीमतोऽप्ययदीक्षितस्यापि अनिर्दिष्ट-प्रवक्तृकशब्द इत्येव ऐतिह्यप्रमाणस्य लक्षणं मान्यमिति केषांचन कथनं न समीचीनम् । यतस्तेन श्रुतिप्रमाणतो भिन्नस्यैतिह्यप्रमाणस्य स्वीकारपूर्वकमलंकार-प्रदर्शनं कृतं व्यर्थं स्यादतः महाजनप्रसिद्ध्या समाचारोऽप्यैतिह्यलक्षणेऽन्तर्भवतीत्यत एव श्रीधरस्वामिकृतं महाजनप्रसिद्धिरूपमैतिह्यलक्षणमेव पौराणिकमिष्टं प्रतिभाति । न तु महाजनप्रसिद्ध्या शिष्टाचारादेर्ग्रहणे तदाचारस्य तच्छिष्य-कर्तृकदर्शनेन तच्छिष्यस्य तादृशक्रियाकरणे इन्द्रियसंयोगजस्य कारणत्वेन प्रत्यक्षप्रमाण ऐतिह्यस्यान्तर्भावः क्रियतामिति चेन्न यदा गुरुकृताचारदर्शनस्याभावः शिष्यश्च तत्रैवाचरति तत्र प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणं वक्तुमशक्यम्, विषयेन्द्रियसंयोगाभावात् । एवं ‘आचारश्चैव साधूनामनस्तुष्टिरेव च’ इति स्मृत्यैतिह्यस्य धर्मज्ञापकसाधवा-



चरणरूपप्रमाणेऽन्तर्भावः क्रियतामिति केषांचिन्मतं न सम्यग्, यतः केवलव्यावहारिके सभाध्यक्षादिनिर्वाचनप्रसंगे धर्माभावेन तद्बोधकस्य “आचार-श्चैव साधूनाम्” स्यात् प्रवेशाभावात् । तस्य व्यवहारबोधकत्वमपि स्वीक्रियत इति चेदास्तां तत्तथा, परन्तु महाजनप्रसिद्ध्या तदप्यैतिह्यप्रमाणकोटावेव समायाति, एतेन “आचारात् स्मृतिं ज्ञात्वा स्मृतेश्च श्रुतिकल्पनम्” इति वचनेनाचारस्य श्रुतिमूलकत्वमेव न तु स्वतन्त्रप्रमाणत्वमिति कथनं न शोभनं व्यवहारे तथा कल्पनाया अभावात् । एवं च श्रीमतः प्रशस्तपादस्यापि मान्यस्य परमप्राचीनस्य ‘व्यासो नारायणः साक्षात्’ इति वचनेन नारायणस्वरूपस्य भगवतो व्यासस्य ‘श्रुतिः प्रत्यक्षमैतिह्यम्’ इति भागवतीयवचने श्रुत्यपेक्षयैतिह्यस्य पृथग्ग्रहणरूपक्रियया स्वतन्त्रमैतिह्यप्रमाणमङ्गीक्रियते । तस्य स्वरूपमपि ‘महाजन-प्रसिद्धिः’ इति श्रीधराचार्यप्रदर्शितमेवोचितम् । महाजनप्रसिद्धिः शब्दोपदेशरूपेण महाजनकृतक्रियारूपेण च संभवति । एवं पौराणिकानां मते सर्वथा सम्भवैतिह्ये पृथक् प्रमाणे एवेति विचारो विदुषां पुरतो निर्णयार्थमुपस्थापितो न तु तत्राल्पोप्याग्रहः । न वा परमादरणीयानां प्रशस्तपादवाचस्पतिमिश्रप्रभृतोनां लेखादौ दोषाविष्करणदृष्टिरित्यलम् ।

# SIMILES IN THE VIṢṆU PURĀṆA

By

V. VARADACHARI

[ विष्णुपुराणे प्रयुक्ताः काश्चिदुपमाः प्रस्तुत्य साहित्यिकदृष्ट्याऽपि पुराणानामध्ययनमतीवोपयोगीत्यस्मिन् निबन्धे प्रदर्शितम् ; विष्णुपुराणस्य रचयित्रा महर्षिपराशरेण स्वरचनायामनेकाः शोभना उपमाः प्रयुक्ताः । प्रावृट्कालवर्णनप्रसङ्गे तु तेन सामान्यलोकजीवनसम्बन्धिन्य एवोपमाः प्रयुक्ताः, एतादृश्य उपमाश्च सद्भावस्य महत्त्वं, असद्भावस्य च होनत्वं प्रतिपादयन्ति । शरद्वर्णनप्रसङ्गेऽपि विष्णुपुराणेऽनेका उपमाः प्रयुक्ताः, परं ता न साधारणलोकजीवनविषयिका, अपि तु ताः प्रायेण विरक्तानां निर्मलचेतसां ज्ञानिनां योगिनां च व्यवहारमेवोदाहरन्ति ; यथा च प्रावृषि कलुषितानां जलानां नभसश्च शरदि नैर्मल्यं प्रजायते, एवं हि संसारासक्तिजनितकालुष्यवन्ति चेतांसि पश्चाज्जायमानेन बोधेन नैर्मल्यं प्राप्नुवन्तीत्यपि ताः सूचयन्ति । ]

Parāśara, the eminent sage and father of Vedavyāsa, is the author of the Viṣṇupurāṇa which is called Purāṇaratna<sup>1</sup>. This Purāṇa, which is an ideal upabrahmaṇa for the Vedas, is written in a uniformly easy flowing and charming style. Parāśara is perhaps one among the authors of ancient days who taught the truths of the Upaniṣads through the garb of a literary composition. The following stanzas could be cited to prove this.

वस्त्येकमेव दुःखाय सुखायेऽप्यौद्भवाय च ।

क्रोषाय च यतस्तस्माद्वस्तु वस्त्वात्मकं कुतः ॥

One and the same thing gives rise to grief, happiness, envy and anger. How then can an object be (considered to be) of its nature ?

तदेव प्रीतये भूत्वा पुनर्दुःखाय जायते ।

तदेव क्रोषाय यतः प्रसादाय च जायते ॥

That itself having given rise to pleasure again produces grief. That itself gives rise to anger and tranquillity.

तस्माद्दुःखात्मकं नास्ति न च किञ्चित्सुखात्मकम् ।

मनसः परिणामोऽयं सुखदुःखादिलक्षणम् ॥

Therefore there is nothing which is of the nature of grief or happiness. The nature of pleasure and pain is on account of the change of mind (mental condition).

Viṣṇupurāṇa II.6.47—49.

The passages show that the objects of pleasure and pain do not exist as such. It is only the mind that is responsible for treating the objects of the world as pleasurable or painful. When this is realised, man can remain indifferent to the objective world and maintain his mental peace.

Rarely does Parāśara indulge in giving comparisons for the effective presentation of the matter which he takes up for treatment. But where he does, he chooses the instances from the way of life of ordinary people. At the same time, his comparisons convey the greatness of the good and expose the hollowness of the wicked. These comparisons serve therefore a didactic purpose and reveal the worldly wisdom (laukika jñāna) of Parāśara. This is evident from the following lines in the description of the sites in the Br̥ṇḍāvana when the rainy season set in.

प्रावृट्कालस्ततोऽतीव मेघौघस्थगिताम्बरः ।

बभूव वारिधाराभिः ऐक्यं कुर्वन् दिशामिव ॥

Then there set in the rainy season with the sky much screened by the multitude of clouds, making all the directions (appear) into one by the showers of rain.

मरूढनवशष्पाढ्या शक्रगोपचिता मही ।

तथा मारकतीवासीत् पद्मरागविभूषिता ॥

The earth, abounding in the well-grown and fresh tender grass and filled with Indragopa, was, as it were possessed of emeralds and decorated with rubies.

ऊहुरुन्मार्गवाहीनि निम्नगाम्भांसि सर्वतः ।  
मनांसि दुर्विनीतानां प्राप्य लक्ष्मीं नवामिव ॥

People observed the waters of the rivers which flowed on all sides deviating from their course and which were like the minds of the wicked (ill-mannered) after their getting fresh wealth.

न रेजेऽन्तरितश्चन्द्रो निर्मलो मलिनैर्धनैः ।  
सद्वादिवादो मूर्खाणां प्रगल्भाभिरिवोक्तिभिः ॥

The spotless moon did not shine being concealed by dark clouds, like the statement (argument) of one who speaks the truth (is passed over) by the impudent utterances of the wicked.

निगुणेनपि चापेन शक्रस्य गगने पदम् ।  
अवाप्यताविवेकस्य नृपस्येव परिग्रहे ॥

The rain-bow (the bow of Indra), though it had no string, got a place in the sky, like a man (who is devoid of merit) gets (a place for) the patronage of the indiscriminating king.

मेघपृष्ठे बलाकानां रराज विमला वतिः ।  
दुर्वृत्ते बृत्तचेष्टेव कुलीनस्यातिशोभना ॥

The white (spotless) line of cranes shone in the background of clouds, like the brilliant activity of the good-mannered born of a good family in that (background) of the wicked.

न बबन्धाम्बरे स्थैर्यं विद्युदत्यन्तचञ्चला ।  
मैत्रीव प्रवरे पुंसि दुर्जनेन प्रयोजिता ॥

The extremely unsteady lightning did not attain stability in the sky, like friendship practised (displayed) by a wicked man for an eminent person,

मार्गा बभूवुरस्पष्टास्तृणशष्पचयावृताः ।

अर्थान्तरमनुप्राप्ताः<sup>1</sup> प्रजडानामिवोक्तयः ॥

The paths were indistinct, covered as they were with the mass of grass<sup>2</sup>, like the utterances of the dull-headed<sup>3</sup> which yield some other sense (i. e. a sense other than the one intended).

उन्मत्तशिखिसारङ्गे तस्मिन् काले महावने ।

कृष्णरामौ मुदा युक्तौ गोपालैश्चेरतुस्सह ॥

At that time, Kṛṣṇa and Rāma moved about happily with the cowherds in the forest having intoxicated peacocks and deer.

Viṣṇupurāṇa V.6 36—44.

In the lines cited above, Parāśara brings out, with great effect, the ways and means adopted by the wicked to prosper in life. The effects of the heavy rain must have been disastrous and so bear a good comparison to the behaviour of the wicked. The description here is made attractive by the apt similes.

In the same section of this Purāṇa, Parāśara gives a vivid description of the autumn. Here too, the author gives comparisons which are of a different kind besides being exquisite like those given in the description of the rainy season. The following stanzas illustrate this :—

तयोर्विहरतोरेवं रामकेशयोर्ब्रजे ।

प्रावृट् व्यतीता विकसत्सरोजा चाभवच्छरत् ॥

As Rāma and Keśava were thus sporting in the cowherd's colony, the rainy season was over and there set in the autumn with blossomed lotuses.

अवापुस्तापमत्यर्थं शफर्यः पल्वलोदके ।

पुत्रक्षेत्रादिसक्तेन ममत्वेन यथा गृही ॥

1. प्रगल्भानां is the reading adopted by Śrīdhara, the commentator on this Purāṇa.

2. तृण grass. शष्प sprouting or tender grass.

3. According to the reading प्रगल्भानां, the second half of this stanza means that clever persons utter statements which yield a different sense.

The śaphala fish (carp) were much oppressed with heat in the water of the ponds, like a house-holder (afflicted) with the sense of ownership due to his attachment for children, land and others.

मयूरा मौनमातस्थुः परित्यक्तमदा वने ।  
असारतां परिज्ञाय संसारस्येव योगिनः ॥

The peacocks remained silent in the forest having given up their dance, like the yogins (remaining silent) after realising the worthlessness of worldly existence.

उत्तुङ्ग्य जलसर्वस्वं<sup>१</sup> विमलासितमूर्त्यः ।  
तत्पुत्राश्रम्वरं मेघा विग्रहं (वि)ज्ञानिनो यथा ॥<sup>२</sup>

The clouds, whose forms were pure and white, receded from the sky having given up their wealth, namely, water, like the wise giving up strife.

शरत्पूर्याशुत्पानि ययुः शोषं सरांसि च ।  
बह्वालम्बममत्वेन हृदयानीव देहिनाम् ॥

The tanks dried up, being heated by the rays of the autumnal sun, like the hearts (minds) of the embodied beings become afflicted with the sense of ownership for many things held by them.

कुमुदैः शरदम्भांसि योग्यतालक्षणं ययुः ।  
अवबोधैर्मनांसीव समत्वममलात्मनाम् ॥

The autumnal waters became suitably united with the lilies like the minds of those whose nature is pure, (getting united) with awakening.

तारका विमले व्योम्नि रराजाखण्डमण्डलः ।  
चन्द्रधरमदेहात्मा योगी साधुकुले यथा ॥

1. जड is an alternative reading.

2. The better reading could be विग्रहं ज्ञानिनो यथा or ग्रहं विज्ञानिनो यथा ।  
ग्रह means tenacity.

The stars stone in the azure sky and the moon also in its full orb, like the Yogin who takes the body for the last time in a good family.

शनकैः शनकैस्तीरं तत्पुत्रं जलशयाः ।  
ममत्वं क्षेत्रपुत्रादिरुद्धमुच्चैर्यथा बुधाः ॥

(The water in the) reservoirs gradually receded from the banks, just as learned men leave aside the sense of ownership which is deeprooted for (with reference to) land, children and others.

पूर्वं त्यक्तैः सरोम्भोभिर्हृसा योगं पुनर्ययुः ।  
क्लेशैः कुयोगिनोऽशेषैरन्तरायहता इव ॥

The swans became united once again with the waters of the tanks which they left before, just as bad Yogins, being affected by obstacles, get (to their share) the miseries which remain (unexhausted).

निभृतोऽभवदत्यर्थं समुद्रः स्तिमितोदक्कः ।  
क्रमावासमहायोगो निश्चलात्मा यथा यतिः ॥

The sea remained noiseless with its still water, like the recluse who becomes unruffled on getting the mahāyoga<sup>1</sup> in due course.

सर्वत्रातिप्रसन्नानि सलिलानि तथाभवन् ।  
ज्ञाते सर्वगते विष्णौ मनांसीव सुमेधसाम् ॥

The waters became very clear on all sides, just as the mind of the intelligent becomes tranquil<sup>2</sup> when Viṣṇu is realised to be present everywhere.

1. Mahāyoga-samprajñātasamādhi, a stage in yogic meditation.

2. The second half of the stanza means, according to Śrīdhara and Viṣṇucitta, the commentators on this Purāṇa, that the mind of the intelligent becomes kindly disposed towards friends and enemies when Viṣṇu is realised to be present everywhere.

बभूव निर्मलं व्योम शरदा ध्वस्ततोयदम् ।  
योगाग्निदग्धक्लेशौघं योगिनामिव मानसम् ॥

The sky became rid of impurity, the clouds having been destroyed by autumn, like the mind of the yogins (which becomes pure) when the multitude of sins are destroyed by the fire of yogic practice.

सूर्याशुनितं तापं निन्ये तारापतिः शमम् ।  
अहम्मानोद्धवं दुःखं विवेकस्सुमहानिव ॥

The lord of the stars (moon) alleviated the heat produced by the sun's rays, just as awakening (destroys) the grief caused by the feeling of egoism.

नभसोऽब्दं भुवः पङ्कं कालुष्यं चाम्भसः शरत् ।  
इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थेभ्यः प्रत्याहार इवाहरत् ॥

The autumn removed the cloud from the sky, mire from the ground and turbidness from water, like *pratyāhāra*<sup>1</sup> which draws away the senses from their objects.

Viṣṇu Purāṇa V-10-1 to 14.

Consistent with the topic of description, namely, autumn when the sky and water become clear, the author shows how awakening (*bodha*) corrects man's behaviour which becomes corrupt due to his attachment for the worldly objects.

These show how the Purāṇas are of interest even to those who would study them for their literary features.

---

1. *Pratyāhāra*, a stage in Yogic practice consisting in the withdrawal of the senses from their objects.



## कूर्मपुराणविषयाणां समालोचनम्\*

पं० गिरिधरशर्मा चतुर्वेदी

[The learned writer here gives a brief summary of the subject matter of the Kūrma Purāṇa, and also discusses and explains certain important topics, such as on Cosmology, monism etc. The Pūrvārdha of the Kūrma Purāṇa contains, in addition to the duties of the four *varṇas* and *āśramas*, the chapters on Cosmology which are based on the Vedic Cosmology as shown by the writer. The Uttarārdha contains two important Gītās, *Viz.* (i) *Īśvara Gītā* in which Śiva explains to the Ṛṣis the true nature of the highest knowledge, and also the various forms of yoga (such as Śūnya-yoga, and Brahma-yoga), together with the various stages of the *aśtāṅga-yoga*; and (ii) the *Vyāsa-Gītā*, in which Vyāsa himself propounds the theory of Karma-yoga according to the Purāṇas. The Uttarārdha gives also, through the mouth of the Sūta, a detailed account of the *tīrthas*, specially of the Śaiva tīrthas, together with an elaborate *māhātmya* or glorification of the Narmadā]

कूर्मपुराणस्य पूर्वार्धस्याग्ने रोमहर्षणसूतस्य नैमिषक्षेत्रे शौनकादीनां समीपे गमनं, शौनकादीनां च पुराणकथाविषयकः प्रश्नः, ततः सूतस्य कूर्मरूपधरं हरिं प्रणम्य अष्टादशानां पुराणानां नामधेयकथनम् । एषु नामसु भागवतानन्तरं पूर्वं भविष्यमेवोक्तं, तदनन्तरं नारदादीनां क्रमस्तु सुव्यवस्थित एव, चतुर्थे च स्थाने शैवं पुराणमेव गणितमित्येव विशेषः । अत्र च

---

\* A summary of the discourses on the Kūrma-Purāṇa given by M. M. Pt. Giridhara Sharma Chaturvedi of Varanasi at Ramnagar during the dark half of the month of Phālguna (February). Such discourses on the Purāṇas are regularly arranged every year by His Highness the Kāśīnareśa. To keep up the old tradition of the *Purāṇa-pāṭha* and the *Purāṇa-pravacana*, the Purāṇa, chosen for the purpose, is recited in the morning and the discourses on it are given in the evening daily for about a week.

पुराणानामनन्तरम् अष्टादशानामुपपुराणानामपि नामधेयानि सन्तीति विशेषः । तदनु कथाप्रसङ्गारम्भे पूर्वं समुद्रमन्थनप्रसङ्गः, न चैव मन्दराख्यस्य पर्वतस्य स्वपीठे धारणार्थं भगवता विष्णुना कूर्मरूपं धृतं स च सर्वैर्देवैर्ऋषिभिश्च स्तुत इति वर्णनम् । ततश्च यदा समुद्राद् भगवती श्रीराविर्भूता, भगवता विष्णुना च सा गृहीता, तदा सर्वैर्देवैर्ऋषिभिश्च 'भगवान् केयं देवी ?' इति पृष्टः कूर्मरूपधरो भगवान् विष्णुरिदमाह—'इयं मे परमा शक्तिर्मायाख्या मद्रूपैव, अनयैव जगद् धार्यते । इयञ्च जगन्मोहयति । अनयैवाहं जगत् उत्पत्तिं प्रलयं च करोमि । इयञ्च सर्वजगत्सूतिः त्रिगुणात्मिका प्रकृतिर्मतः प्रागेव संजाता । देवपितृमनुष्याद्याः एतां न विदन्ति' इति ।

अस्यायमेवाशयः, यद् शक्तिः शक्तिमांश्च अभिज्ञावेव भवतः । यथाऽ-  
भेदाहकत्वशक्तिर्नाग्नेर्भिन्ना भवति तथैव सर्वत्र बोद्धव्यम् । वेदान्तिनश्चेतां  
मायाशक्तिं भेदाभेदाभ्यामनिर्वाच्यां वदन्ति । अनिर्वाच्यां च पदार्थेन न  
द्वैतं भवति, इत्यद्वैतमेव ते मन्यन्ते । अतएव अभिन्नत्वमेवानुसंधाय मत्तः  
पूर्वमियं जातेति भगवतोक्तम् । शक्तिशक्तिमतोः पौर्वापर्यं नास्तीत्यैवान्नामिष्यः ।  
अथवा आगमशास्त्रे शक्ताः पूर्वं शक्तिमेव वदन्ति । सा शक्तिरेव स्वाश्रयं  
स्वभर्तारं कल्पयति ।

अनन्तरञ्च विस्तरं पृष्टेन भगवता कूर्मेण इन्द्रद्युम्नकथा वर्णिता ।  
इन्द्रद्युम्नो हि भगवन्तमारामयाञ्चक्रे । तस्य सम्मुखे श्रीः प्रादुर्बभूव तेन  
पृष्ट्या च स्वतत्त्वं बोधयामास । पुनश्च केनोपायेन भगवान् ज्ञातुं शक्य  
इति पृष्ट्या, भगवन्तमेवाराधयेत्युक्तवती । तेनाराधितश्च भगवानपि दर्शनं  
ददौ, कल्याणोपायान् पृष्टश्च वर्णाश्रमाचारवता पुरुषेण भगवान्महेश्वरः  
समाराध्यः, तेन कल्याणं प्राप्यते इत्याद्युक्तवान् । तथाकुर्वश्चेन्द्रद्युम्नः  
कल्याणं प्राप्तः ।

अनन्तरं ऋषिदेवादिभिः पृष्टेन भगवता कूर्मेण पूर्वमाश्रमाचारा विवृताः ।  
इद्वैव च भगवता कूर्मेण सृष्टिं विवृण्वता प्रसादाद् ब्रह्मण उत्पत्तिः कथिता ब्रह्मणा  
च श्रियं दृष्ट्वा 'अनया जगन्मोहय' तत् एव मया सृष्टिः कर्तुं शक्येत इति

प्रार्थितो देवी श्रियं जगन्मोहयेति कथयामास । ये तु नारायणस्य महेश्वरस्य च भक्तिपरायणा वर्णाश्रमाचाररताश्च तान्नमोहयेत्याद्युक्तम् । अनन्तरञ्च वर्णधर्मा भगवता कूर्मेणोपदिष्टाः । तदनु सृष्टिविषयं ब्रूहीति पृष्टेन सृष्टिरुक्ता तत्र चतुर्व्यूहो महेश्वरः सर्वनियन्ता सर्वतोमुखः सनातनोऽस्ति तत्प्रेरितश्च त्रिगुणमव्यक्तं सृष्टिं करोतीत्यादिविवरणम् । तत्र च प्रथमं ब्रह्मा समवर्तत तस्य ब्रह्मणो दिनमेव सृष्टिः, रात्रिश्च प्रलयः । अयं नैमित्तिकः प्रलयः ।

अत्रायमाशयः, ये प्राणिनो यावत्सूर्यं पश्यन्ति तावत्तेषां दिनं, यावच्च सूर्यो यैनं दृश्यते तावत्येव तेषां रात्रिरिति सम्प्रदायः । अस्मासु मनुष्येषु तु स्पष्टमेवैतन्न विवरणापेक्षम् । पितरश्च विधूर्ध्वभागे स्थिताः कृष्णाष्टमीमारभ्य शुक्लाष्टमीपर्यन्तं सूर्यं पश्यन्ति । अमावास्यायां सूर्यश्चन्द्रश्च सहैवोदयमस्तञ्च प्रयात इति चन्द्रस्यापरभागगतानां शिरस्येव सूर्य इति अमावास्या तेषां मध्याह्नकालो भवति । अस्मदभिमुखस्तु चन्द्रभागस्तस्मिन् दिने न प्रकाशते इत्यस्माभिश्चन्द्रोऽमायां न दृश्यते । भवतु नाम एवं रीत्या पञ्चदशदिनानि पितृणां सूर्यदर्शनं शुक्लाष्टमीमारभ्य कृष्णाष्टमी पर्यन्तन्तु तेषां सूर्यस्यादर्शनमिति रात्रिः । पूर्णिमायां यदास्मदभिमुखो भागश्चन्द्रस्य पूर्णः प्रकाशते तदोर्ध्वभागस्थितानां न प्रकाशश्लेशसम्बन्ध इति पूर्णिमा तेषां मध्यरात्रकालः । एवं रीत्याऽस्माकं मासेन पितृणामेकमहोरात्रं भवति । अनयैव रीत्या ये देवाः सुमेरुपर्वते ध्रुवस्याधस्तान्निवसन्ति तैरुत्तरगोलस्थितः सूर्यो निरीक्ष्यते, दक्षिणगोलस्थस्तु न निरीक्ष्यते । स्वस्त्यस्वस्तिकावत्यंशपरिमितमेव द्युमण्डलं सर्वैर्दृश्यत इति । ध्रुवाच्च नवत्यंश विषुवद्वृत्तपर्यन्तमेव पूर्णा भवन्तीति । सूर्यो हि भगवान् मासषट्कं विषुवतो दक्षिणे, मासषट्कञ्च विषुवत उत्तरे परिभ्राम्यति । ततश्च मासषट्कपर्यन्तं सूर्यस्यानवरतं दर्शानामासषट्कमितन्देवानां दिनम् । मासषट्कमिता च सूर्यस्यादर्शनाद्वात्रिरित्यस्माकं संवत्सर एव देवानामहोरात्रम् । अनयैव रीत्या ब्रह्मणा यावत्सूर्यो दृश्यते तावत्तस्य दिनम्, अदर्शने च रात्रिरिति फलति । ब्रह्मणश्च क्वावस्थितिरिति विचारे भूः, भुवः, स्वः, महः, जनः, तपः, सत्यम् इति प्रत्यहं जप्यमानव्याहृत्यर्थभूताः ये सप्त लोका अधोर्ध्वभावेन सन्ति सन्निविष्टाः, तेषां सर्वेषामुपरि योऽयं सत्यलोकः स्वयंभूलोकापरपर्यायश्श्रुतः

स एव ब्रह्माणः स्थानमिति पुराणप्रसिद्धिः । स च सर्वेषामुपरि व्याप्त इति तत्कुक्षावेव सर्वे लोकाः स्थिताः । तृतीये लोके स्वरित्याख्ये च स्थितः सूर्योऽपि कदापि कुत्राप्यवस्थितो ब्रह्माणोऽदृश्यो भवति । स खलु तदैव ब्रह्माणो अदृशः स्याद्यदा स्वयं विशोर्णो भूत्वा प्रलयं यायात् । तदित्यमेकस्य सूर्यस्य यावदवस्थितिः तावद् ब्रह्माणो दिनम्, यावत्तु ब्रह्मा स्वपिति अपरः सूर्यो नोत्पद्यते तावत् ब्रह्माणो रात्रिः । इयमेव ब्रह्माणो रात्रिर्नैमित्तिकप्रलय इत्युच्यते । अस्मिन् प्रलये भूः, भुवः, स्वरिति ख्यातानां त्रयाणां लोकानां सूर्यसम्बद्धानां विनाशो भवति । महारित्याद्या ऊर्ध्वलोकास्तु तथैवावतिष्ठन्ते । अस्यैव ब्रह्माणो दिनस्य कल्पशब्देनाभिधानम्, तत्र चतुर्दशानां मनूनां गणना च पुराणेषु कृता । अस्माकं सहस्रयुगपर्यन्तमेतद्दिनम्, तावत्येव च रात्रिरित्यहोरात्राणां गणनस्य मासवर्षादिक्रमेण यदा शतवर्षात्मकं ब्रह्माण आयुः पूर्णं भवति तदा एको ब्रह्मापि लयं यातीति तदात्वे प्राकृतप्रलय उच्यते । तदा च सर्वे लोकाद्या प्रकृतौ प्रत्यक्षं तिष्ठन्ति । पुनश्च महारात्र्यन्ते तेषां सृष्टिर्जायते इति पौराणिकी परिभाषा । सैवात्र निरुक्ता । प्राकृतप्रलयान्ते च महेश्वरस्यापि रात्रिरित्युच्यते । यस्मात् सर्वदेवैकरसस्याविकृतस्य महेश्वरस्य न दिनं न वा रात्रिरिति वक्तुं शक्यं तस्मात् लोकदृष्ट्या तत्राप्येवं व्यवहारः क्रियते ।

अथ प्राप्तपरिपाकानां प्राणिकर्मणामुद्बोधवशेन महेश्वरस्य सिसृक्षा जायते । तदा स भगवान् योगेन प्रकृतिं पुरुषं च प्रविश्य क्षोभयति । अत्र च इष्टान्तोऽस्मिन् पुराणेऽभिहितः —

यथा मदो नरस्त्रीणां यथा वा माधवोऽनिलः ।

अनुप्रविष्टः क्षोभाय तथाऽसौ योगमूर्तिमान् ॥ (१।४।१३)

यद्यपि प्रकृतिपुरुषावपि भगवतो न भिन्नौ पुराणेषु अद्वैतवादस्यैवाभ्युपगमनात्, तथापि “स एव क्षोभको विप्राः क्षोभ्यश्च परमेश्वरः । स संकोचविकारमाणां प्रधान्त्ये व्यवस्थितः” ॥ ततश्च क्षोभ्यमानात् प्रधानात् प्रधानपुरुषात्मकं सत् प्रादुरभूत् । तदेव जगद्बीजम्, तदेव च महान् आत्मा, मतिः, ब्रह्मा, प्रवृद्धिः, स्रष्टा, ईश्वरः इत्यादिभिः शब्दैरुच्यते । तस्माच्च महतः त्रिविधोऽद्वैतः प्रादुरभूत् । वैकारिकः, तैजसः, भूतादिश्चेति तस्य तिस्रो विधाः । अयश्चाद्वैतः

अभिमानकर्ता, मन्ता, आत्मा जीवश्चेत्यादि पदैराख्यायते । अथ सत्त्वप्रधाना-  
द्वैकारिकादहंकारात् वैकारिका दश देवा इन्द्रियाधिष्ठातारः मनश्चैकादशं प्रादुरभूत्,  
तैजसाच्च इन्द्रियाणि । भूतादेस्त्वहंकारात् तमःप्रधानात् पूर्वं शब्दतन्मात्रं,  
शब्दतन्मात्राच्चाकाशः, आकाशाद्विकुर्वाणात् स्पर्शतन्मात्रम् । ततश्च  
स्पर्शगुणको वायुः, वायोः रूपतन्मात्रम् ततस्तद्गुणकं तेजः, तेजसो रसतन्मात्रम् ।  
ततश्च रसाधाराणि अम्भांसि, ततः गन्धतन्मात्रं, ततो संघातरूपा गन्धगुणा पृथिवी ।  
अथ पूर्वस्य पूर्वस्य महाभूतस्य उत्तरोत्तरस्मिन् अनुप्रवेशात् आकाश एकगुणः,  
वायुर्द्विगुणः, तेजस्त्रिगुणम्, जलं चतुर्गुणम्, पृथिवी च पञ्चगुणा जायते ।  
एतानि सर्वाण्यपि भूतानि त्रिगुणात्मकानि परस्परानुप्रवेशात् परस्परधारकाणि  
च । एतानि च महदादीनि सप्त पृथग्भूतानि यदा किमपि कर्तुं न शक्नुवन्ति  
तदा सप्तापि संभूय अण्डमुत्पादयन्ति । जलबुद्बुदवत् तदण्डमुदकेशयमेवा-  
भवत् । अस्मिंश्च प्रवृद्धे अण्डे क्षेत्रज्ञो नाम हिरण्यगर्भः प्रादुर्भवति । स  
एष प्रथमश्शरीरो पुरुषश्चाख्यायते । अयमेव सर्वेषां भूतानामादिकर्ता । य  
एष प्रधानादपि परः पुरुष आख्यातः स एव हिरण्यगर्भरूपेण प्रादुर्भवति ।

मेरुरुत्त्वमभूत्तस्य जरायुश्चापि पर्वताः ।

गर्भोदकं समुद्राश्च तस्यासन् परमात्मनः ॥ (१।४।४०)

अस्मिन्नेवाण्डे सूर्यचन्द्रादिकसनक्षत्रं सदेवासुरमानुषं जगत् स्थितम् ।  
अत्र च पृथिव्यादीनि पञ्चभूतानि दशदशगुणैरुत्तरोत्तरैर्भूतैरावृतानि । सर्वाणि  
च भूतानि अहंकारेण तदपि च महता तदपि चाव्यक्तेनावृतानि । अत्र च एत-  
दभिमानिनोः योगज्ञा पुरुषास्तिष्ठन्ति । इदं ब्रह्माण्डं प्रजापतेर्द्वितीया मूर्तिरिति  
वैदिकी श्रुतिराह हिरण्यगर्भश्च तृतीयं भगवद्रूपम् । अथ तस्मादेव हिरण्य-  
गर्भात् चतुर्मुखो ब्रह्मा प्रादुरभूत् । स एव रज आश्रित्य सृजति । सत्त्वमा-  
श्रित्य पालयति, तम आश्रित्य च रुद्रस्वरूपेण सर्वं संहरति । यदृच्छया च  
नानारूपाणि करोति । एतानि रूपाणि तस्य गुणविशिष्टानि वस्तुतः स एक  
एव । अयमेव च नानाकार्यकरणात् बहुशक्तित्वाच्च आदिदेवः, प्रजापतिः,  
महादेवः, ब्रह्मा, ऋषिः, नारायणः हरिरित्यादिनामभिरुच्यते । एतावत्पर्यन्तं  
भगवतो अबुद्धिपूर्विका सृष्टिः ।

इदमत्राकूतम्—रसो बलञ्चेति सर्वस्यापि जगतो द्वे मूलतत्त्वे । तत्र रसो निर्विकारः सदैकरूपो मुख्यो विभुश्च न तद्विनाकृतं किञ्चिदपि स्थानमस्ति । बलन्तु क्षणावस्थायि अल्पाल्पमात्रञ्च परं संख्यया तदनन्तम् । ततः सर्वत्रैव रसं तदप्यभिव्याप्नोति । तद्वि प्रवाहरूपेण नित्यम्, स्वरूपेण तु क्षणावस्थायि । यथा गङ्गातटे स्थितः पुरुषः प्रतिक्षणमेव जलं स्वचक्षुषोऽग्रे पश्यति परं यत्नं पूर्वस्मिन् क्षणे दृष्टं तदुत्तरक्षणे नास्ति । नवं नवं जलं प्रतिक्षणं गच्छत्यागच्छति च । इयमेव प्रवाहनित्यता उच्यते । तद्वरीत्यैव बलमपि रसाश्रितं बोद्धव्यम् । अस्य च जलस्य न स्वतन्त्रा सत्ता किन्तु रसाश्रितं तत्सत्तयैव सत्तावत्प्रतीयते । इदञ्च रसापेक्षया भिन्नमभिन्नं वेति न निर्वक्तुं शक्यते । तस्मादनिर्वचनीयम् । अनिर्वचनीयत्वादेव च न द्वैतं भवति मिलितं तद्व्ययमेकमेवाख्यायते । अतो जगतो मूलमेकमेवोच्यते । इदञ्च बलं यावत्सुप्तं तावद्रसादभिन्नरूपमेव जागरितेन तु तेन अपरिच्छिन्नोऽपि रसः स्वस्य परिच्छिन्नत्वात् परिच्छिन्न इव दृश्यते । यथा हि तरङ्गाः समुद्रजलं स्वपरिच्छिन्नमेव दर्शयन्ति तद्वत् । एवं—परिच्छेदेन दर्श्यमानो रसः पुरुषरूपो भवति । स एव रसप्राधान्ये पुरुषः, बलप्राधान्ये तु प्रकृतिरित्याख्यायते । तत एवात्र प्रकृतिरपि महेश्वरात् भिन्नेत्युक्तम् । अत्र पुरुषरूपत्वे तस्य त्रयो भेदाः क्रमेण प्रादुर्भवन्ति—अव्ययः, अक्षरः, क्षरश्च । यदा बलं सीमानं करोति परं तत्र चित्तिर्नित्यत्वा न जायते सोऽव्ययपुरुष इत्युच्यते । यदा तु यथा गृहनिर्माणे इष्टकोपरि क्रमेणान्या इष्टकश्चोद्यन्ते तथा बलोपरि बलान्तराणि यदा चीयन्ते तदा तथा चित्या अक्षरपुरुषः प्रादुर्भवति । यद्यपि बलं क्षणिकमिति चितिस्तत्र न संभवति तथापि रसाश्रितं तत्प्रवाहरूपं भवतीति तरङ्गोपरि तरङ्गाणामिव तत्र चितिस्संभवति । एवं प्रवृद्धया चित्या यदा बलानां परस्परं ग्रन्थिर्जायते तदा क्षरपुरुषप्रादुर्भावः । यथा च रसप्राधान्ये अव्ययः, अक्षरः, क्षर इति त्रयो भेदा भवन्ति तथैव बलप्राधान्ये महानहंकारः तन्मात्राश्चेति भवन्ति भेदाः । एषाञ्च परस्परं सम्मेलनान् सर्वोऽपि सर्गः प्रजायते । अत्रोक्तस्याव्ययपुरुषस्य परिच्छिन्नत्वात् सति परिच्छेदे कलाप्रादुर्भावाच्च भवन्ति पञ्चकलाः—आनन्दः, विज्ञानम्, मनः, प्राणः, वागिति । तत्र मनः प्राणो वागिति सृष्टिसाक्षिण्यः । आनन्दो विज्ञानं मन इति तु मुक्तिसाक्षिण्यः । अत्र प्राणमाधारीकृत्याक्षरस्य प्रादुर्भावः

धाचमाधारीकृत्य तु क्षरस्येति अव्ययः सर्वेषामालम्बनम् । अक्षरपुरुषस्यापि सन्ति पञ्चकलाः—ब्रह्मा, विष्णुः, इन्द्रः, अग्निः, सोमश्चेति । प्राणमाधारीकृत्याक्षरस्य प्रादुर्भाव इत्युक्तं प्राक् । प्राणे च प्रतिक्षणं गत्यागती प्रवर्तते । सर्वे हि पदार्थाः प्रतिक्षणं परेभ्यः किञ्चन ददति परेभ्यश्च किञ्चिदाददते । यथा दीपः स्वप्रकाशं सर्वत्र प्रवेशयति तैलञ्चोपादत्ते तथैव सर्वत्र बोद्धव्यम् । तत्र यथा शक्त्या आगमनञ्जायते सा विष्णुरित्युच्यते । यथा तु निर्गमनं सा इन्द्र इत्युच्यते । अनुक्षणं प्रवर्तमानयोरपि गत्यागत्योः तदेवेदं वस्तु इति प्रत्यभिज्ञायते तदिदं प्रतिष्ठाप्राणरूपेण ब्रह्मणा क्रियते त एते त्रयो ह्यद्याः । अग्नीषोमौ तु पृष्ठधाविति ताभ्यामेव जगदुत्पाद्यते । अथ क्षरपुरुषस्यापि सन्ति पञ्च कलाः, प्राणः, आपः, वाक्, अन्नादः, अन्नमिति । एवमेव बलप्रधानानां महादादीनामपि भेदा जायन्ते इतीयं संक्षिप्ता वैदिकी सृष्टिप्रक्रिया । तामेवाधारीकृत्यपुराणान्यपि प्रवर्तन्ते । अत्र महेश्वरो य आख्यातः स परात्परः पुरुषः तत एव प्रकृतिपुरुषप्रादुर्भाव उक्तः । अक्षरपुरुषस्य च भेदाः ब्रह्मा, विष्णुर्महादेव इत्याद्याः स्थाने स्थाने निरूप्यन्ते तत्तत्रैव व्याख्यास्यामः । अत्र इन्द्रः, अग्निः, सोमः, इति त्रीनेकीकृत्य पौराणिक-भाषायां महादेव इत्युच्यते इति स्मर्तव्यम् । स एव महादेवोऽत्र प्रक्रियायां व्याख्यातः, पुराणानि च सांख्यसमादृतां प्रकृत्यादिप्रक्रियामेव प्रायेणाधारीकुर्वन्तीति सैव प्रक्रिया अत्रोक्ता । केवलं प्रसिद्ध-सांख्यदर्शनादयमेव भेदः यदत्र प्रकृतिस्वातन्त्र्यं न मन्यते । महेश्वरादेव प्रकृतिरूपज्ञा तेनैव च क्षोभ्यमाणा जगत्सृजतीति । तिस्रो मूर्तयश्च भगवतो या आख्याताः तत्रायं भावः त्रिधा तावदस्मच्छास्त्रेषु ब्रह्मोपासनं विधीयते विश्वरूपेण, विश्वचररूपेण विश्वातीतरूपेण च । ता एव तिस्रो मूर्तयोऽत्राख्याताः । एकं विश्वं स्पष्टमेव, विश्वचरश्च हिरण्यगर्भः, स एव विश्वं व्याप्य तत्परिचालयति । भगवान् महेश्वरश्च विश्वातीत इति । यश्चायमण्डे ब्रह्मप्रादुर्भाव उक्तः स क्षर पुरुष एव स्वावयवैर्जगत्सृजतीत्यग्रे व्याख्यातव्यं तदप्यत्रानुसन्धेयम् ।

अथात्र स्पष्ट्यादौ कालकल्पना उक्ता सा पूर्वमेवास्माभिर्व्याख्याता । तत्र त्वयं विशेषः परार्धमिति सर्वतः परा परमा संख्या संस्कृतभाषायां गण्यते । परार्धद्वितयश्च ब्रह्मण आयुर्भवति । अस्मद्वर्षापेक्षया ब्रह्मण आयुषो गणनायां द्विपरार्धपरिमिता-

न्येव दिनान्यायान्तीति गणितक्रमेणानुसन्धेयम् । अथात ऊर्ध्वं महीप्रादुर्भावः कथमिति वर्ण्यते । तदेतद् वराहप्रादुर्भावप्रकरणम् । वराहोऽयं यज्ञरूपेण वायुरूपेण च तत्र तत्र व्याख्यातः । यदा हि जले आपः, फेनः, मृत्सना, सिकता, शर्करा, अश्मा, अयो, हिरण्यमिति क्रमेणाष्टविधा जायन्ते तदा तासां विधानां संगृह्य पिण्डीकरणार्थं सर्वतोमुखो विलक्षणो वायुः प्रचलति । स एव सर्वानवयवान् संहत्य पिण्डरूपतां नयति । अयमेव वायुः वृणोति च अह्नोति चेति वराह आख्यायते इत्युक्तं ब्राह्मणेषु ।

अतएव वराहदंष्ट्रायां पृथिवी स्थितेति व्याख्यायते शास्त्रेषु । तेनैव सर्वतः प्रसूतवरेण वायुनाऽद्यापि पृथिवीपिण्डं ध्रियत इति । अयमेव वराहो यज्ञरूपेण भागवतादिषु व्याख्यातः । इह तु ऋषिभिर्व्यापकरूपेणैव संस्तुतः ।

अथ सृष्टिं वितन्वतो भगवतः पूर्वमबुद्धिपूर्वकः सर्गः प्रादुरभूत् । तमो मोहः, महामोहः, तामिस्रः अन्धतामिस्रश्चेति । इमे एव योगदर्शने अविद्या, अस्मिता, रागः, द्वेषः, अभिनिवेश इति पञ्चक्लेशा आख्यायन्ते । इमानि बुद्धेस्तामसानि रूपाण्येव इति एषां सृष्टौ बुद्धेर्नोपयोगः इतीयमबुद्धिपूर्विका सृष्टिरुक्ता । एतैः पञ्चभिः क्लेशैरेव वेष्टिताः सर्वेऽपि प्राणिनो जायन्ते, इत्येषां सर्गः पूर्वमावश्यकः । तदनु चतुर्दशविधः प्राणिनां सर्गः प्रतिपादितः । पूर्वं नगानां वृक्षलतादीनां सर्गः मुखे जातत्वादिमे मुख्या उच्यन्ते, तदनु तिर्यग् योनीनां चतुर्विधः सर्गः । सरीसृपाः, पक्षिणः, मृगाः ( आरण्याः ) पशवः ( ग्राम्याः ) चेति । एतं सर्गमसाधकं मत्वा ऊर्ध्वक्षोतसां देवानां सात्त्विकः सर्गः प्रवर्तितः । तेषामष्टविधत्वमन्यत्राख्यातम् । अनन्तरञ्च अर्वाक्षोताः मनुष्यसर्गः प्रादुरभूत् । इमे मनुष्याः रज्जोवहुला प्रायेण दुःखिनो जायन्ते । इत्येवं महदाद्या अष्टौ सर्गाः कथिताः । मनुष्याणामग्रे भूतादीनां सर्गोऽत्र पुराणे विशेषेणोक्तः । स तमःप्रधानः पिशाचादीनां सर्गो विज्ञेयः ।

अथ मनुष्येषु पूर्वं सनकादीनां पञ्चानां कुमारानां मानससर्गो ब्रह्मणा कृतः । इमे च पञ्चापि योगिनो वैराग्यपरमाः सृष्टिं कर्तुं न प्रवृत्ताः । इमांश्च सर्गोऽप्रवृत्तान् विलोक्य ब्रह्मणः दुःखं क्रोधश्च उदभूत । क्रोधाविष्टस्य तस्य



ललाटनीललोहितो भगवान् महादेवः प्रादुरभूत् । स्वयमेव परमेश्वर इदानीं प्रादुर्भूतः । ब्रह्मा प्रणम्य तं प्रजासर्गार्थमाह । तदा भगवान् महादेव आत्मना सदृशान् रुद्रान् ससर्ज । ये जरामृत्युविवर्जिताः सदैकरूपा आसन् । तान्दृष्ट्वा ब्रह्मणा जरामृत्युयुतान् प्राणिनस्तुजेति प्रार्थितो भगवान् नाहं जरामृत्युयुतान् स्रक्षयामीति प्रोवाच । तदा ब्रह्मणा स सर्गात्रिवारितः । ततश्च ब्रह्मा स्थानाभिमानिन कालाभिमानिनश्च नदीसमुद्राधिष्ठातृन् कलाकाष्ठाद्यधिष्ठात्रींश्च पूर्वं ससर्ज, तदनु च स्वशिरोऽवयवेभ्यः सप्तर्षीन् ससर्ज । त एते गृहस्थाः सृष्टौ प्रवृत्ताः सर्वान् ससृजुः ।

अनन्तरञ्चात्र देवादीनां सर्गः पुनर्विस्तरेणोक्तः । पूर्वं जघनादसुरा सृष्टाः । असुरान् सृष्ट्वा च सा तनुस्तेन त्यक्ता रात्रिर्बभूव । इयं रात्रिस्तमोबहुला अस्याञ्चासुराणां प्राधान्यञ्जायते । ततश्च ब्रह्मा सत्त्वबहुलं तनुमास्थाय मुखतो देवान्सृजत् । दीव्यत इमे जाता इति देवा उच्यन्ते । ततः देवान्सृष्ट्वा सापि तनुस्तेन त्यक्ता, दिनं बभूव । तत्सत्त्वबहुलं तत्रैव च देवा प्रभवन्ति । ततश्च पुनः सत्त्वमात्रात्मिकां तनुं गृहीत्वाऽस्मानं पितृवन्मत्वा तेन पितरः सृष्टाः । सापि च तनुस्तेन त्यक्ता, सन्ध्याऽभवत् । तत एव सन्ध्यापि सत्त्वप्रधाना पितृणाञ्च तत्र बलाधिक्यम् ततश्च रजोमात्रात्मिकां तनुं गृहीत्वा मनुष्यास्तेन सृष्टाः सा च तनुस्त्यक्ता, ज्योत्स्ना बभूव । तस्मान्मनुष्याः ज्योत्स्नायां हृष्यन्ति । एवमेव स्वावयवेभ्यः सर्वे प्राणिनः सृष्टाः ।

अत्रायमाशयः—यथास्माभिः पूर्वमुक्तं क्षरः पुरुषः तन्मात्रारूपाम् प्रकृतिमुपादाय स्वावयवेभ्यः सर्वान्प्राणिनः सृजतीति तथैवात्र क्षरः पुरुषो ब्रह्मा तत्तद्गुणबहुलास्तास्तास्तनूरुपादाय देवादीन् ससर्ज प्रकृतिश्च परिवर्तनशीला स्वत एव निवर्तते इत्येव तनुपरित्यागस्याशयः । तेषु तेषु कालावयवेषु चापि तमः-सत्त्वादिप्राधान्यं बोधयितुं तत्तत्तनुरूपत्वं कालावयवानामुक्तम् । मनुना हि भगवता “ऋषिभ्यः पितरो जाताः; पितृभ्यो देवदानवाः । देवेभ्यश्च जगत्सर्वं” इत्याद्युक्तम् । ते ऋषिपितृदेवाः प्राणरूपाः । इमे त्वत्रोक्ताः प्राणिरूपास्तच्छोकनिवासिन इत्येवं विरोधोऽयं समाधेयः ।

अग्रे ऋषिप्रश्नं समाधातुं भगवतो रुद्रस्य ब्रह्मण सकाशात् प्रादुर्भावो विस्तरेण विवृतः । तदग्रे च सूर्यचन्द्रवंश्यानां राज्ञां चरितेषु चन्द्रवंशे भगवतः कृष्णस्य प्रादुर्भावः, तत्कृतं महेश्वरतपश्च विवृतम् ।

उत्तरार्धारम्भे ऋषिभिः परमं ज्ञानं पृष्टो रोमहर्षणो यावद् वक्तुमुष्कमते तावदेव तत्रैव भगवान् व्यासः समागतः । रोमहर्षणेन दण्डवत् प्रणिपत्य मुनीन् प्रत्युक्तं यदेष साक्षात् भगवान् समायातः इत एव शुश्रूषध्वम् । स्वयञ्च व्यासं प्रत्युक्तं “एते मुनयः परमं ब्रह्मज्ञानं श्रोतुमिच्छन्ति कृपया भवता बोध्यन्ताम् ।” तदा व्यासेनोक्तं “एकदा सनत्कुमाराद्या अन्येऽपि च कणाद-कपिलाद्या बहव ऋषयः पूज्ये बदरिकाश्रमे नारायणमिदमेव ज्ञानं पृष्ठवन्तः । एषां संवादकाले एव तत्र भगवान् शिवः तत्रैवाविर्भूतः । किञ्च भवन्तो विचारयन्तीति तान् पृष्ठवान् । ततश्च तैः प्रार्थितः स्वयमेव ब्रह्मतत्त्वं सर्वान् बोधयितुं प्रवृत्तः । इन्द्रमोक्षरगीतेत्युच्यते । सैव च मया भवद्भ्यश्चाव्यते” इत्युक्त्वा भगवान् व्यासः ईश्वरगीतां श्रावयामास । तत्र हि भगवता यदुपदिष्टं तस्यायं सारः— ज्ञानमेव परं संसारे व्यासम् । तच्च विमूढा अर्थरूपेण पश्यन्ति योऽस्माज्जगतः परोऽस्ति स सर्वान्तरः साक्षाच्चिन्मात्ररूपः । स एवान्तर्यामी पुरुषः, प्राणः, महेश्वरः काल इत्यादिशब्दैरुच्यते । स एव च मायया विविधास्तनूः करोति । वस्तुतः स पाणिपादादिभिरिन्द्रियैर्विहीनः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वादिभ्रमैश्च द्वीनः । यथा हि प्रकाशतमसोः परस्परं सम्बन्धः सर्वथा असम्भाव्यः तथैव तस्य मायया मायिकेन जगता चैक्यं सर्वथा असम्भाव्यमेव । यथा च छाया मलिना तथा जीवात्मापि स्वभावतो मलिनो विकारी च । एवं मलिनस्य मुक्तिः कदापि न सम्भवति । यदा तु मुनयो विकारहीनं निर्द्वन्द्वमानन्दरूपमात्मानं पश्यन्ति तदा मुक्ता भवन्ति । कर्तृत्वसुखदुःखाद्यभिमानोऽहंकारजन्यः । स च जनैरात्मन्यारोपितः । योगिनस्तु प्रकृतेः परं शुद्धमात्मानं पश्यन्ति । यद्यप्यात्मा स्वयंज्योतिः परमहंकारेण सहाविविक्तं सदसदात्मकं जनाः पश्यन्ति । प्रधानं पुरुषं च पृथक् पृथक् बुद्ध्वा कूटस्थं निरञ्जमात्मानमक्षररूपं योगिनः पश्यन्ति । अस्य रागद्वेषादयो दोषाश्च केवलं आन्तिनिबन्धनाः । इत्याद्यात्मोपदेशोऽत्र कृतः । अग्रे च भगवद्गीतायामिव सांख्ययोगविभागोऽपि

दर्शितः । भगवद्गीताया अर्थतः क्वचिच्छब्दतोऽपि च छायाञ्ज  
लक्ष्यते, यथा—

“यतो गुह्यतमं देहं सर्वगं तत्त्वदर्शिनः ।  
प्रविष्टा मम सायुज्यं लभन्ते योगिनोऽव्ययम् ॥  
ये हि मायामतिक्रान्ता मम या विश्वरूपिणी ।  
लभन्ते परमं शुद्धं निर्वाणं ते मया सह ॥” इत्यादिः  
(२।२।५३-५४)

अग्रे च सृष्टिं विवृण्वता भगवता अव्यक्तात् कालः, प्रधानं, पुरुषश्चामूवन्निति  
कथितम्, तेभ्यश्च सर्वमिदमुत्पन्नं तस्मात् ब्रह्ममयमेव सर्वं जगदिति । प्रकृतेश्च  
महान् ततश्चाहंकारो जायते । एक एव महानात्मा अहंकार इति, जीव इति,  
अन्तरात्मेति च कथ्यते । तेनैव सर्वं सुखं दुःखञ्च वेद्यते । तस्य  
विज्ञानात्मकस्य मन उपकारकं भवति । मनस एव साचिव्यात् पुरुषस्य  
संसारः । प्रकृत्यादिसंग्रश्च पुरुषस्य कालेन जायते, उक्तं हि—

कालः सृजति भूतानि कालः संहरते प्रजाः ।  
सर्वे कालस्य वशगा न कालः कस्यचिद्वशे ॥  
सोऽन्तरा सर्वमेवेदं नियच्छति सनातनः । (२।३।१६-१७)

स एव भगवान् नारायणः सर्वज्ञः पुरुषोत्तम इत्यादिशब्दैरुच्यते ।  
सोऽहमेव ब्रह्माव्यय इति भगवतोपदिष्टम् ।

इत्यादि सर्वमुपदिश्य च भगवान् महेश्वरो स्वमैश्वरं भावं दर्शयन् नतर्त ।  
देवा ऋषयश्च तं महादेवं विष्णुना सह नृत्यन्तं ददृशुः । क्रमेण च सहस्रबाहुं  
सहस्रशिरसं चन्द्रार्धशेखरम्, जटामण्डितं चर्मवसनं शूलपाणिनं स्वेन तेजसो सर्वं  
ब्रह्माण्डमावृत्य स्थितं ददृशुः । दर्शकानाञ्च नामान्यप्यत्रोक्तानि, यथा—

सनत्कुमारः सनको भृगुश्च सनातनश्चैव सनन्दनश्च ।  
रेभ्योऽङ्गिरा वामदेवोऽथ शुक्रो महर्षिरत्रिः कपिलो मरीचिः ॥ (२।५।१८)

एते च सर्वे जगदीश्वरं रुद्रं तथाविधं दृष्ट्वा स्वं कृतार्थं मन्यमाना मूर्धा  
प्रणम्य स्तोतुं प्रवृत्ताः । स्तुतौ च सर्वात्मकत्वमेव भगवतो विवृतम् । ब्रह्मविष्णु-

रुद्राणाञ्चैक्यमेवोद्घोषितम् । एवं सर्वात्मा सर्वरूपो भगवान् नृत्यं दर्शयित्वा पुनः परमं रूपं संहृत्य प्रकृतिस्थोऽभवत् । पुनश्च ऋषयः तद्रूपदर्शनेन कृतार्थतां घोषयन्तः पुनर्माहात्म्यं पप्रच्छुः । तदा भगवता पुनः स्वीयं माहात्म्यं बहुधा बोधितम् । अग्रे च स्वीया विभूतयोऽपि बोधिताः । अग्रे च सरस्वती, पार्वती सावित्र्याद्या भगवैव वशगा इत्याद्यप्युक्तम् । प्रकृतेः सृष्टिवर्णनञ्च मध्ये मध्ये कृतम् । अग्रे च ऋषिभिः पृष्ठम्—

निष्कलो निर्मलो नित्यो निष्क्रियः परमेश्वरः ।

तन्नो वद महादेव विश्वरूपः कथं भवान् ॥ (२।९।१)

अत्रोत्तरमीश्वरस्य—

नाऽहं विश्वो न विश्वश्च मामृते विद्यते द्विजाः ।

मायानिमित्तमात्रास्ति सा चात्मनि मयाश्रिता ॥

अनादिनिधना शक्तिर्माया व्यक्तिसमाश्रया ।

तन्निमित्तः प्रपञ्चोऽयमव्यक्ताज्जायते खलु ॥

अव्यक्तं कारणं प्राहुरानन्दं ज्योतिरक्षरम् ।

अहमेव परं ब्रह्म मत्तोऽह्यन्यन्न विद्यते ॥

तस्मान्मे विश्वरूपत्वं निश्चितं ब्रह्मवादिभिः ।

एकत्वे च पृथक्त्वे च प्रोक्तमेतन्निर्दर्शनम् ॥ (२।९।२-५)

अग्रे चोपनिषच्छ्रुतोः प्रदर्श्य माहात्म्यं ख्यापितम् । एकादशाध्याय-भारभ्य च योग उपदिष्टः । तत्र योगो द्विविधः—शून्ययोगो ब्रह्मयोगश्च । मनसो विलयो यो निर्विकल्पकसमाधिरूपेण योगदर्शने उक्तः स शून्ययोगः महेश्वरैकाग्रता तु ब्रह्मयोगः सर्वतः श्रेष्ठः । अग्रे योगस्याष्टानामङ्गानां विवरणम् । अन्ते च योग्येभ्य शिष्येभ्य इदं प्रदातव्यमिति नारायणाय देवेभ्यश्च समुपदिश्य भगवतोऽन्तर्धानम् । अत्रैवेश्वरगीतासमाप्तिः ।

अग्रे च भगवतो व्यासस्य स्वतन्त्र उपदेशो व्यासगीतानाम्नाऽत्र संगृहीतः । तत्र प्रतिज्ञावाक्ये “कर्मयोगं शृणुतेति प्रतिज्ञा” अत्र च कर्मयोगो न भगवद्गीता-स्त्विव निष्कामकर्मानुष्ठानरूपः, अपितु शास्त्रोक्तः सर्वोऽपि कर्मकलापः कर्मयोगपदेन

संगृहीतः । तत्र पूर्वं विस्तरेण ब्रह्मचारिणो धर्माः स्मृत्यायुक्ता इव व्याख्याताः । यज्ञोपवीतं कथं परिधायं गुरुशुश्रूषा कथं कार्या इत्यादि सर्वं विवृतम् । अभिवादनादिप्रकारोऽपि सर्वोऽभिहितः । आचमनं कुत्र कुत्र कार्यम् इत्याद्यपि विवृतम् ।

चतुर्दशाध्याये गुरुरपरिचर्याविधिः, अग्रे तर्पणादिविधिरपि पञ्चदशाध्यायमारभ्य स्नात्वा गृहाश्रमप्रवेशः, तत्र च दण्डस्थाने वैणव्या यष्टेर्धारणं शोधकं कमण्डलुं छत्रोष्णीशापादुकादिधारणं यथाशक्त्या भूषणादिधारणञ्च विवृतम् ।

अन्यत्र काञ्चनाद् विप्रो न रक्तां विभृयात्सजम् ।

शुक्लांबरधरो नित्यं सुगन्धः प्रियदर्शनः ॥

न जीर्णमलवद्भासा भवेद्वै वैभवे सति ।

न रक्तमुल्वणं चान्यधृतं वासो न कुण्डिकाम् ॥

नोपानहौ स्रजं वाथ पादुके न प्रयोजयेत् । (२।१५।५-७)

इत्याद्या आचारा अपि सम्यग्विवृताः । ततो विवाहविधिः । अन्या गृहस्थोचिता चर्या सर्वात्र विवृता । षोडशेऽध्याये चापि गृहस्थचर्यैव विस्तरेण प्रतिपादिता ।

नाधार्मिकैर्वृते ग्रामे न व्याधिवहुले भृशम् ।

न शूद्रराज्ये निवसेत् न पाखण्डजनैर्वृते ॥

हिमवद्विन्ध्ययोर्मध्ये पूर्वपश्चिमयोः शुभम् ।

मुक्त्वा समुद्रयोर्देशं नान्यत्र निवसेद् द्विजः ॥ (२।१६।२३-२४)

इत्यादीनि निवासस्थानान्यपि विवृतानि ।

नोच्छिष्टः संविशेन्नित्यं न नमः स्नानमाचरेत् ।

न गच्छन् षष्ठेद्वापि न चैव स्वशिरः स्पृशेत् ॥ (२।१६।६८)

इत्याद्या आचारा अपि विस्तरेण विवृताः । सप्तदशेऽध्याये च भोज्यान्नानाम् पुरुषाणाम्, भोज्यान्नानाञ्च विवरणम् । तदनु च भक्ष्याभक्ष्य व्यवस्थापि विवृता । अष्टादशेऽध्याये च कैः कर्मभिः ब्राह्मणाद्या मुक्ता भवेयुरिति ऋषीणां प्रश्नः । तत्र च भगवतो व्यासस्योत्तरे प्रातःस्नानस्य विशेषतः प्रशंसा

अन्येषामपि स्नानानां विवरणम् । अग्रे च सूर्योपासनायाः शङ्करोपासनायाश्च विवरणम् । अन्येऽप्याचाराः स्मृत्याद्युक्ताः । देवपूजादीनामत्र विशेषेण विवरणम् ।

यो मोहादथवाऽज्ञानादकृत्वा देवतार्चनम् ।

भुङ्क्ते स याति नरकं शूकरं नात्र संशयः ॥ (२।१८।११८)

इत्यादिना देवपूजाया नित्यत्वमपि व्यवस्थापितम् ।

उनविशाध्याये चभोजनविधिविवरणम् शयनविधिविवरणमपि चात्रैव । अथ विंशाध्यायमारभ्य श्राद्धकल्पः । पूर्वं श्राद्धकालदेशादिविवरणम्, अग्रे च निमन्त्रणीयानां ब्राह्मणानां लक्षणाद्याख्यानम् ; तत्र च कश्चिद्विशेषोऽपि,

यथा—

भोजयेद्योगिनं शान्तं तत्त्वज्ञानरतं यतः ।

अभावे नैष्ठिकं दान्तमुपकुर्वाणकं तथा ॥

तदलाभे गृहस्थन्तु मुमुक्षुं सङ्गवर्जितम् ।

सर्वालाभे साधकं वा गृहस्थमपि भोजयेत् ॥ (२।२१।१५-१६)

किञ्च—

अपि विद्याकुलैर्युक्ता हीनवृत्ता नराधमाः ।

यत्रंते भुङ्क्ते हृद्यं तद्वेदासुरं द्विजाः ॥ (२।२१।२६)

इत्यादिना वृत्तप्रशंसापि श्रूयते । अग्रे च निमन्त्रितानां ब्राह्मणानां निमन्त्रकस्य श्राद्धकर्तुंश्च धर्मा विवृताः । तत्रैतद्विशेषतो द्रष्टव्यम्—

आमन्त्रितो ब्राह्मणो वै योऽन्यस्मै कुरुते क्षणम् ।

स याति नरकं घोरं शूकरत्वं प्रयाति च ॥

आमन्त्रयित्वा यो मोहादन्यं चामन्त्रयेद् द्विजः ।

स तस्मादधिकः पापी विष्ठाकीटोऽभिजायते ॥ (२।२१।७-८)

द्वाविंशमध्यायमारभ्य च कल्पोक्तः सर्वोऽपि श्राद्धविधिर्मन्त्रप्रतीकनिर्देशपूर्वकं निर्दिष्टः । तत्र चायमारम्भः—

ततो निवृत्ते मध्माहे लुप्तरोमनखान्द्विजान् ।

अवगम्य यथामार्गं प्रयच्छेदन्तधावनम् ॥

तैलमभ्यञ्जनं स्नानं स्नानीयञ्च पृथग्विधम् ।  
पात्रैरौदुम्बरैर्दद्याद्वैश्वदेवस्यपूर्वकम् ॥ (२।२२।२०-२१)

अग्रे च भोजनप्रसङ्गे—

भिक्षुको ब्रह्मचारो वा भोजनार्थमुपस्थितः ।  
उपविष्टस्तु यः श्राद्धे कामं तर्मापि भोजयेत् ॥  
अतिथिर्यस्य नाश्नाति न तच्छ्राद्धं प्रशस्यते ।  
तस्मात्प्रयत्नाच्छ्राद्धेषु पूज्या ह्यतिथयो द्विजैः ॥ (२।२२।३१-३२)

एवं सर्वोऽपि विधिरत्र विवृतः । भोजनेषु च मांसानामपि संग्रहोऽत्र कृतः ।

त्रयोविंशेऽध्याये च अशौचविवरणम् । तत्र जननाशौचे अयं विशेष  
उक्तः—

दशाहं निर्गुणे प्रोक्तमाशौचं वातिनिर्गुणे ।  
एकद्वि त्रिगुणैर्युक्तश्चतुर्थैकदिनैः शुचिः ॥ (२।२३।७)

जननाशौचे सषिण्डानां स्पर्शनिषेधो नास्ति मरणाशौचेऽपि चतुर्थेऽह्नि स्पर्श  
इति स्पष्टमुक्तम् । अग्रेऽपि बालादीनामाशौचे स्मृत्युक्तमाशौचं निर्गुणानामेवेति  
भूयो भूय उक्तम् । वैतान उपासनाश्च परद्वारेण फलादिभिः कारयितव्या  
इत्यपि स्पष्टमुक्तम् ।

अथ किञ्चित्प्रमादेन म्रियतेऽग्निविषादिभिः ।  
तस्याशौचं विधातव्यं कार्यञ्चैवोदकादिकम् ॥ इति च ।  
(२।२३।६४)

किञ्चायमपि विशेष उक्तः—

जाते कुमारे तदहः कामं कुर्यात्प्रतिग्रहम् ।  
हिरण्यघान्यगोवासस्तिलांश्च गुडसर्षिषा ॥  
फलानि पुष्पं शाकञ्च लवणं काष्ठमेव च ।  
तक्रं दधि घृतं तैलमौषधं क्षीरमेव च ॥ (२।२३।६५-६६)

आशौचिनो गृहाद् ग्राह्यं शुष्कान्नञ्चैव नित्यशः ।  
आहिताग्निर्यथा न्यायं दग्धव्यस्त्रिभिरग्निभिः ॥ (२।२३।६७)

अग्रेऽपि मृताशौचेऽयं विशेषः—

पिण्डं प्रतिदिनं दद्युः सायं प्रातर्यथाविधि ।  
प्रेताय च गृहद्वारि चतुर्थे भोजयेद् द्विजान् ॥ (२।२३।७०)  
पञ्चमे नवमे चैव तथैवैकादशेऽहनि ।  
युग्मांश्च भोजयेद्विप्राववश्राद्धन्तु तद् द्विजाः ॥ (२।२३।७२)

सर्वेऽपि च प्रेतकल्पोऽत्र संक्षेपेणोक्तः । अग्रे चतुर्विंशेऽध्याये  
श्रीतस्मार्ताग्निहोत्रविवरणम् । अग्रे दानधर्माद्या गृहस्थवृत्तय एव विवृताः ।  
सप्तविंशेऽध्याये च वानप्रस्थाश्रमधर्माः । तत्र नानाविधानि तेषांसि वर्णितानि ।  
अथाष्टाविंशे यतिधर्माः, तत्र संन्यासस्य बहवो भेदा उक्ताः, यथा—

ज्ञानसंन्यासिनः केचिद् वेदसंन्यासिनः परे ।  
कर्मसंन्यासिनस्त्वन्ये विविधाः परिकीर्तिताः ॥  
यः सर्वसङ्गनिर्मुक्तो निर्द्वन्द्वश्चैव निर्भयः ।  
प्रोच्यते ज्ञानसंन्यासी स्वात्मन्येव व्यवस्थितः ॥  
वेदमेवाभ्यसेन्नित्यन्निर्द्वन्द्वो निष्परिग्रहः ।  
प्रोच्यते वेदसंन्यासी मुमुक्षुर्विजितेन्द्रियः ॥  
यस्त्वन्मीनात्मसात्कृत्वा ब्रह्मार्पणपरो द्विजः ।  
स ज्ञेयः कर्मसंन्यासी महायज्ञपरायणः ॥ (२।२८।५-८)

संन्यासिनाञ्च धर्मेषु उक्तम्—

भैक्षेण वर्तयेन्नित्यन्नैकाद्यादी भवेत् क्वचित् ॥  
यस्तु मोहेन वाऽन्यस्मादेकाद्यादी भवेद् यतिः ।  
न तस्य निष्कृतिः काचिद्धर्मशास्त्रेषु कथ्यते ॥ (२।२८।१७-१८)



इदमपि चोक्तम्—

एकवासा द्विवासा वा शिखी यज्ञोपवीतवान् ।

कमण्डलुधरो विद्वान् त्रिदण्डी याति तत्परम् ॥ (२।२८।३१)

अस्य च ध्येयमुक्तम्—

महान्तं पुरुषं ब्रह्म ब्रह्माणं सत्यमव्ययम् ।

सितं सितेतराकारं महेशं विश्वरूपिणम् ॥

ओङ्कारेणैव चात्मानं संस्थाप्य परमात्मनि ।

आकाशे देवमीशानं ध्यायीताकाशगन्धमगम् ॥ (२।२९।१४-१५)

अग्रे च धर्मातिक्रमे यतीनां प्रायश्चित्तान्युक्तानि । इतः परं त्रिंशमध्याय-  
मारभ्य चतुस्त्रिंशदध्यायान्तं प्रायश्चित्तानां विवरणम् । तत्रैव च व्यासगीता  
समाप्तिः । ततः परं ऋषिभिः सूतस्तीर्थविस्तरः पृष्टः । स च नानाविधानि  
तीर्थान्याह । तत्र शैवतीर्थानामाधिक्यम्, नर्मदामाहास्यञ्चातिविस्तृतम् ।  
ग्रन्थसमाप्तिपर्यन्तं ( चतुश्चत्वारिंशाध्यायपर्यन्तं ) तीर्थानामेव वर्णनम् ।

मध्ये च देवदारुवनवृत्तान्तः । तत्र हि भगवान् शङ्करः स्वलीलयाऽति-  
सुन्दरं रूपं कृत्वा दिगम्बरः ( नमः ) ऋषीणामाश्रमेषु प्रविष्टः । विष्णुश्च  
स्त्रोरूपधारिणं सह निनाय । सापि स्त्री बहुसुन्दरी वस्त्राभरणभूषिता  
तमनुगच्छति स्म । एवंभूतं शङ्करं दृष्ट्वा ऋषिपत्न्यः पतिव्रता अपि  
मोहात्तमनुजग्मुः ऋषिबालकाश्च विष्णुरूपायां स्त्रियामासक्ताः नानोपहासान् चक्रुः ।  
तेन च कुपिताः ऋषयः शिवमायाविमोहितास्तं लोष्टल्लुडादिप्रहारैस्ताडयामासुः ।  
केवलं वशिष्ठाश्रमे पतिव्रताशिरोमणिभूतया अरुन्धत्या स पूजितः चिकित्सितश्च ।  
पुनश्च ऋषिभिर्बहुधा भर्त्सितस्तदुक्त्या स स्वीयं लिङ्गं छित्त्वा तत्रैव पातयामास ।  
स्वयञ्च विष्णुना सहान्तर्दधे । तदा च देवदारुवने महान्त उत्पाताः प्रादुरभूवन् ।  
तदा अत्रिपत्न्या अनसूयया “अयं देवो महादेव आसीत् भवद्विश्राज्जनेन ताडित  
इति भवतां भयमुपस्थितम्” इत्येवं ऋषयो बोधिताः । सर्वे च ते ब्रह्मणः  
समीपे गत्वा सर्वं वृत्तमाचक्षुः । तदा ब्रह्मणो बह्वनुशोचिताश्च तदाज्ञया

तत्रैव देवदारुवन आगत्य तं लिङ्गं वैदिकेन विधानेन पूजयामासुः । पुनश्च शङ्करस्य दर्शनमवाप्य कृतार्था बभूवुरित्यादि । अनन्तरञ्च पञ्चचत्वारिंशोऽध्याये प्रतिसर्गं निरूप्य ग्रन्थसमाप्तिः कृता । देवदारुवनकथायाश्चेदमेव तात्पर्यम् यल्लिंगं प्रकृतिः । तामेव प्रकृतिं प्रधानीकृत्य भगवांस्तत्र गतः । त्रिगुणया प्रकृत्या मोहिताश्च ऋषयो तत्र जज्ञिरे । यदा तेन प्रकृतिर्विसृष्टा ब्रह्मणा च प्रकृतावेव भगवान् पूज्य इत्यादिष्टं तदा तत्पूजनेन पुनः प्रकृतिरहितो भगवांस्तैर्दृष्ट इति । अन्ते च फलश्रुत्या ग्रन्थसमाप्तिः ।

---

### पुराणरत्नानि

अविवेको हि सर्वेषामापदां परमं पदम् ।

विवेकरहितो लोके पशुरेव न संशयः ॥

( ना० पु०, १।१४० )

आत्मवत्सर्वभूतानि पश्यतां शान्तचेतसाम् ।

अभिन्नमात्मनः सर्वं को दाता दीयते च किम् ॥

( ना० पु० १।११।१२० )

# STUDIES IN PURĀNIC GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOGRAPHY ŚĀKADVĪPA

By

BUDDHA PRAKASH

[अत्र महाभारते पुराणेषु चोपवर्णितानां शाकद्वीपस्य चतुर्णां—‘मग’, ‘मगग’, ‘गानग’, ‘मन्दग’ इत्यादिनामभिरभिहितानां—जनपदानां तत्सम्बन्धेन च तेषां मूलभूतत्वेनात्र प्रतिपादितानां ‘यूरेशिया’ महाद्वीपस्य ‘सिथियन’ प्रमुखीनां कासाश्चित् प्राचीनजातीनां सविस्तरं प्रामाणिकं च वर्णनं पुरस्कृत्य शाकद्वीपस्य चतस्रोऽपि जातयः ईरानदेशीयाः काश्चित्प्राचीना जातय एवासन्ति प्रतिपादितम् । ‘मग’ शब्दः ‘ईरान’ देशस्य ‘मगु’ नाम्न्याः प्राचीनजात्याः सूचक एव । अस्या अपि जात्याः प्रधानं कर्म पौरोहित्यमासीत् । ‘मगग’ ‘गानग’ शब्दौ च वाङ्मिलग्रन्थे प्रोक्तयोः ‘मगग’ ‘गग’ इत्येतयोः प्राचीनजात्योर्बोधकौ स्तः । उभेऽप्येते ‘गग’ ‘मगग’ जाती ‘यूरेशिया’ महाद्वीपस्य स्टेपीजाख्यानां प्रदेशानां प्राचीना ‘सिथियन’ नाम्नीत्वरी जातिरेव । ‘सिथियन’ जातिश्चेयम् अतिप्राचीनकाले ‘ईरान’देशे प्रविष्टा, तत्र च कञ्चित्कालमुषित्वा स्थिरा सभ्या च जाता । शाकद्वीपस्य चतुर्थो जनपदः ‘मन्दगाः’ इति प्रसिद्ध आसीत् ; अयमपि ‘ईरान’ देशस्य ‘माद’ (वैवोलियनलेखेषु ‘मान्द’) नाम्ना विख्याता प्राचीनजातिरेव ।

शाकद्वीपस्य भूगोलीया स्थितिरपि लेखकेनात्र विचारिता । महाभारते पुराणेषु च कथितानां शाकद्वीपस्य वर्षाणां पर्वतानां नदीनां च वर्णनमाश्रित्य शाकद्वीपोऽयं ‘कैस्पियन’ सागरस्योत्तरतः पूर्वतः पश्चिमतश्च स्थिताः प्राचीनप्रदेशा एव, न तु ‘गैरेनि’ नाम्ना पाश्चात्यविदुषा मताः ‘स्याम’ ‘कम्बोज’ प्रभृतयो देशाः । शाकद्वीपीया जनाः सूर्यपूजका एवासन् ; तेषां श्यामवर्णत्वं च न तत्रस्थश्यामाख्यपर्वतजनितम्, अपि तु पुरा चीनप्रभृतिदेशेषु उदीच्याः श्यामाः इति रूपेण प्रसृता काचिज्जनश्रुतिरेव ‘शाकद्वीपीयाः प्रजाः श्यामाः’ इत्यादिपुराणवचनस्योपपादिका ।]

In several Purāṇas we have the legend of the construction of the temple of the sun somewhere on the bank of the river Candrabhāgā (Chenab) by Samba, the son of Kṛṣṇa, for the

installation of an image of that god which was flowing down the river past his hermitage at Mitravana. When the temple was ready, Sāmba approached Nārada to seek his advice about the selection of priests for its worship. The divine sage exhorted him to consult the image of the sun-god which decried the Brāhmaṇas of Jambūdvīpa and advised Sāmba to repair to Śākadvīpa and bring priests from there for purposes of worship at his temple.<sup>1</sup> Śākadvīpa is described as situated away from Jambūdvīpa on the other side of the salt ocean, and is said to surround the sea of milk, 'Kṣīroda'.<sup>2</sup> In the corresponding verse in the *Mahābhārata*, the variants of *Kṣīroda* are *ikṣūda* and *ikṣuvārivatā* (containing sugarcane juice) showing that the idea of the sweetness of the water of this ocean was prominent.<sup>3</sup> The people of Śākadvīpa are grouped into four classes viz., Maga, Magga, Gānaga and Mandaga, corresponding to the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śudras of India.<sup>4</sup> In the

1. *Sāmbapurāṇa*, 26, 23—गर्हितं मानवं शास्त्रं न प्रशंसन्ति ते द्विजाः  
*Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* I, 139—न योग्याः परिचर्यायां जम्बूद्वीपे ममानथ । मम पूजाकरं गत्वा  
शाकद्वीपादिहानय ॥

2. *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* I, 139—

लवणोदात्परे पारे क्षीरोदेन समावृतः ।

जम्बूद्वीपात्परो यस्माच्छाकद्वीप इति स्मृतः ॥

3. *Mahābhārata* VI, 12, 9 (Critical Poona edition, ed. S. K. Belvalkar)  
Vol. 7 p. 63.

क्षीरोदो भरतश्रेष्ठ येन संपरिवारितः । The variants are इक्षूद-सागरस्तथा and  
इक्षुवारिवता सर्वा ।

4. *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* I, 139—

तत्र पुण्या जनपदाश्चतुर्वर्णसमन्विताः ।

मगाश्च मगगाश्चैव गानगा मन्दगास्तथा ॥

मगा ब्राह्मणभूयिष्ठा मगगाः क्षत्रियाः स्मृताः ।

वैद्यास्तु गानगा ज्ञेयाः शूद्रास्तेषां तु मन्दगाः ॥

*Brahmapurāṇa* Ch. XX, vv. 71-72

मगा ब्राह्मणभूयिष्ठा मगगाः क्षत्रियास्तु ते ।

वैद्यास्तु मानसास्तेषां शूद्रा ज्ञेयास्तु मन्दगाः ॥

शाकद्वीपं स्थितैर्विष्णुः सूर्यरूपधरो हरिः ।

यथोक्तैरिज्यते सम्यक् कर्मभिर्नियतात्मभिः ॥

*Mahābhārata* these people are enumerated as *Maga*, *Maśaka*, *Mānasa* and *Mandaga*.<sup>1</sup> The variants of 'maga' are 'Saga', 'Maṅga', 'maṅka', 'maṅka' and 'madu'; those of 'maśaka' are 'maṣaga', 'makhaṣa', 'gaṇka', 'mayaka', 'magadha' and 'makaśa'; that of 'mānasa' is 'mānaga' and those of *Mandaga* are 'mandaka', 'nandaka', 'madaka' and 'manaka'.<sup>2</sup> In the *Sāmbapurāṇa* their readings are *maga*, *māmaga*, *Mānasa* and *mandaga*.<sup>3</sup> A variant of *māmaga* is *masaga*<sup>4</sup> and another is *māyaga*.<sup>5</sup> In the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* the names of these people are *mrga* (*maga*) *māgaḥḥa*, *mānasa* and *mandaga* and in the *Brahmupurāṇa* these are *maga*, *māyadha*, *mānasa* and *mandaga*.<sup>6</sup>

Gereni has identified *Sākadvīpa* with Siam, Kamboja and Lower Cochin-China on the ground that the *Sāka* trees growing there abundantly according to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* are the same as *Mai Sak* trees or teak trees which are the prominent products of these regions and that the Śāka race associated

*Agnipurāṇa* Ch. 119 verse 21—

मगां मगधमानस्या मन्दगाश्च द्विजातयः ।

यजन्ति सूर्यरूपन्तु शाकः क्षीराब्धिना वृतः ॥

*Kūrmapurāṇa* I, 48, 36-37; *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* Ch. 53, verse 76f.; *Garuḍapurāṇa* Ch. 56, vv. 14-15; *Viṣṇupurāṇa* II, 47, 69.

1. *Mahābhārata* VI, 12, 33—

तत्र पुण्या जनपदाश्चत्वारो लोकसंमताः ।

मगाश्च मशकश्चैव मानसा मन्दगास्तथा ॥

2. *Mahābhārata* (Critical edition) ed. by S. K. Belvelkar Vol. VII p. 66.

3. *Sāmbapurāṇa* 26, 30-31; R. C. Hazra, 'Sāmbapurāṇa, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. 36 (1955) p. 70; *Varāhapurāṇa* Ch. 178 vv. 55-57.

साम्बः सूर्यप्रतिष्ठां च कारयामास तत्त्वित् ।

वदयाचले च संश्रित्य यमुनायाश्च दक्षिणे ॥

मध्ये कालप्रियं देवं मध्याह्ने स्थाप्य चोत्तमम् ।

मूलस्थानं ततः पश्चात् अस्तमानाचले रविम् ॥

स्थाप्य त्रिमूर्तिं साम्बस्तु प्रातर्मध्यापराह्निकम् ।

4. Nagendra Nath Vasu, *Castes and Sects of Bengal* IV p. 9.

5. Hara Prasad Sastri, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Asiatic Society of Bengal* V p. 753.

6. *Viṣṇupurāṇa* II, 4, 69-70; *Brahmupurāṇa* XX, 71.

with this region signifies the *Sak* or *Suk* tribes living along the *Melchong* river and the *Thek* or *Sak* peoples of ancient Burma<sup>1</sup>. This scholar is inclined to identify the milk-ocean (*Kṣīroda-Sāgara*) situated in Śākadvīpa with the sea encompassing the eastern littoral of the Malay peninsula and the coastline of Siam and Kamboja as far as the Me-Khong delta, or in a word, the southern-most portion of the so-called China-sea. According to him, the name *Kedrendj* or *Kendendj* is derived from Sanskrit *Kṣīroda* or *Kṣīrārṇava*<sup>2</sup>. That this view is erroneous is manifest from the following study of the tribes of Śākadvīpa mentioned in the Purāṇas and the epics.

The first tribe of *Śākadvīpa* mentioned in Indian works is *Maya* or *Maka*, the important variants of this word being *Saga* and *Mada*, as noted above. *Sīya* is a prakritised form of *Saka*, and *Mada* stands for *Māda*, an Iranian tribe mentioned in the Assyrian records of 843 B.C. in association with the *Pārsa* for the first time. About 900 B. C., these Aryan tribes advanced from the Caspian Gates on the road leading to Babylon, the *Pārsa* occupying the Kirmanshahan region and the *Māda* settling from the Caspian Gates near east of Ragā to the pass near east of Hamadan. As regards the form *Maya*, it represents *magus* meaning an Iranian priest which became *Mobāz* in later times. The chief priest *magūpati* likewise became the *Mobāzan-mobāz* in Sassanian times. The magus or magupathis, besides discharging the duties of priests had the judicial and financial administration in their hands as we

1. G. E. Gernet, *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia* pp. 164-165.

2. *ibid.* p. 164, Gernet proposes some thrilling identifications in connection with Śākadvīpa. *Bhavya*, the King of Śākadvīpa according to the *Vikṛantapūrvā*, is Bhavavarman who reigned in Kamboja about 600 A. D. The divisions of Śākadvīpa *Julala* and *Kumira* are *Chên-la*, the Chinese name for Kamboja since the beginning of the 7th century and the promontory of *Kumiri* near which the *Kumari* River finds its outlet respectively. The mountains of this region *Udayagiri*, *Astagiri* and *Syāmagiri* are respectively *Udai*, *Lestui* and *Siam*. The rivers flowing in this territory *Nalini*, *Manojavi* and *Purojavi* are the Me-Khong, Lau Java, Saba or Tha-be (Zaba of Ptolemy) near the modern Saigon.

gather from the Persepolis tablets. In the Avestā we do have the expression *hapax magu thiš* but ordinarily instead of the word *magu* the titles *karpan*, *thesa*, *athravan*, *ethrya*, *ethrapati* relating to the office of *magu* occur<sup>1</sup>. The people following this profession formed a distinct class which led to the conception of a tribe of 'magi' current among Greek observers, notably Herodotus (I, 101). To quote Herzfeld, "without being a 'tribe' in the genetic meaning, the magi were regarded as a 'tribe' in the political meaning." In a society founded upon classes and tribes, and becoming more complex in course of time, fictitious tribes originate. While the genuine tribes own their land, these have 'no heritage', but are dispersed over the entire state. The abstract *denā* of Zoroaster, the religion, is a similar case. Politically it is regarded as a *Vrsanam*, community.<sup>2</sup> These notions combined in the tribal designation '*Maga*' found in the Purāṇas cited above. The reference to *Maga* in a tribal context and the specification of its functional significance by the equation of the Magas with the Brāhmaṇas (*magā brāhmaṇa-bhūyithāḥ*) throws a flood of light on the synthesis of these diverse notions.

The second tribe of 'Śākadvīpa' is *Magaga* according to the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* and *maśaka* according to the *Mahābhārata*, other variants of this word being *magaka* and *ganaka*. Whereas *magaka* is very near to *magaga*, *ganaka* has an unmistakable similarity with *gānaga*, the third tribe of Śākadvīpa according to the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. As a matter of fact the

---

1. Ernst Herzfeld, *Zoroaster and his World* Vol I p. 124.

2. *ibid* I p. 125 'magus' is believed to mean a 'slave'. Moulton has given examples on the authority of J. G. Frazer that members of a subject tribe were employed as priests by the conquerors. In historical times, however, the Magi became the Levites of the Zoroastrians. It was they alone who presided over the ceremonious slaying of the victim, prepared the sacred haoma and held the holy bundle of bareama. (Percy Sykes, *History of Persia* (3rd ed.) Vol I p. 111). For *Maga* and *Magu* see R. G. Bhandarkar, *Saivism, Vaishnavism and Minor Religious Systems* p. 153. P. C. Bagchi holds that *Maga* can be equated with the *Maka* of old Persian inscriptions, who were a Median tribe according to Herodotus. (P. C. Bagchi, *India and Central Asia* p. 128).

names *magaga* and *ganaka* or *gānaga* are so closely inter-related that one easily becomes the variant of the other. These words *ganaka* or *gānaga* and *magaga* are evidently identical with the names *Gog* and *Magog* occurring in the Old Testament and their variants *Yājūj* and *Mājūj* figuring in the Qurān. In the *Book of Genesis* (X, 2), Magog is counted among the descendants of Japheth<sup>1</sup>: In the *Book of Ezekiel* (XXXVIII, 2-9), we have a graphic description of *Gog*: 'O mortal man, set your face towards Gog, of the land of Magog, the great prince of Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him and say, 'Thus says the Lord God—"Behold, I am against you, O Gog, the great prince of Meshech and Tubal; I will turn you round and put hooks in your jaws: and I will lead you out with all your army, horses and horsemen, all of them in full panoply, a mighty host, equipped with buckler and shield, all of them wielding the sword-Persia, Cush and put, all of them equipped with shield and helmet, together with Gomer and all his hordes, from the farthest north, many a people with you—"You shall advance like a storm, you shall come like a cloud covering the land, you and all your hordes and many a people with you".'<sup>2</sup> In this text there is a reference to the vast cavalry of Gog equipped with bows and arrows coming from the farthest north and swooping on the quiet people living in security in villages and towns. In the following section of the *Books of Ezekiel* God promises to destroy these ruthless invaders like this: "To ravenous birds of every sort and to the beasts of the field, will I leave you as food. And I will send fire against Magog, and against those who live securely in the coast lands."<sup>3</sup> Gog and Magog are also mentioned in the romance of Alexander available in Syriac and Ethiopic versions. At one place they are counted among the twelve kingdoms and at another among the twenty-two kingdoms of the north-east which carry fire and sword in the neighbouring sedentary kingdoms. In this account they are described as men with blue

---

1. *The Complete Bible, An American translation* p. 8.

2. *Ibid* p. 798.

3. *Ibid* p. 799.



eyes and red hair, wearing skins, eating raw meat, drinking human blood, living in booths and tents, shunning towns and cities and the people residing there. Their fleet-footedness is compared to that of stags and horses, and the bellicose spirit of their women is particularly emphasised.<sup>1</sup> Their vast numbers, irresistible might and relentless warfare qualified them as the scourges of God. "Now among all the nations of the world there are no folk more numerous than they, for they are like the sand of the sea (shore) and God Almighty chastiseth whatsoever nation be pleaseth by them, and there are no folk who are more numerous than they or more strong and mighty."<sup>2</sup> They are particularly stated to have pillaged and ravaged the land of Persia. "In the matter of the land of Persia it is they who have forced a way into their great and strong fortresses, and it is they who have scattered their kings and their mighty men of war, and they have carried off into captivity their children together with those who begat them and they have laid waste all their land and countries."<sup>3</sup> According to these legends Alexander built the gates of iron and brass to keep away these terrible tribes. This feat of Alexander is referred to in the *Qur'ān* (XVIII, 93-94) also :

"Until when he reached  
 (A tract) between the mountains,  
 He found beneath them a people  
 Who scarcely understood a word,  
 They said : 'O Zul-qarn'ain !  
 The Gog and Magog (people)  
 Do great mischief on earth.  
 Shall we then render thee  
 Tribute in order that  
 Thou mightest erect a barrier  
 Between us and them ?'"<sup>4</sup>

---

1. E. A. Wallis Budge, *The History of Alexander the Great* pp. 230-232.

2. *ibid* p. 233.

3. *The Holy Qur'ān* by Abdullah Yusuf Ali Vol. I. pp. 755-756.

4. *ibid* Vol. II p. 914.

In *Sura XXI-96* of the *Qur'ān* these tribes are mentioned in connection with the devastation of the Last Days :

“Until the Gog and Magog (people)  
Are let through (their barrier)  
And they swiftly swarm  
From every hill.”

They are predicted to be so numerous as to drink all the water of the Euphrates and the Tigris and of the lake of Tiberias. When they have killed the inhabitants of the earth, they will shoot their arrows against heaven whereupon God shall send worms into their nostrils, necks or ears which will kill them to the last man in one night, or a host of birds will catch them and drown them in the sea.<sup>1</sup> In the *Annals* (XVI, 16) of Tabari these people are divided into three groups, those as cedars, those as broad as they are tall and those who can cover their bodies with their ears.

The aforesaid notices indicate that the depredations and devastations of the Gog and Magog had left an indelible impression on the minds of ancient people. The data about them show that they are not mythical beings but historical peoples with definite ethnic traits and cultural characteristics. Their blond faces with red hair and blue eyes appear in the frescoes of Kyzyl and Turfan.<sup>2</sup> The Chinese ascribed these features to the WU-SUN<sup>3</sup> of Jungaria, and Ammianus Marcellinus noted them in regard to the Alains.<sup>4</sup> Their nomadic life in booths and tents, their wanderings with flocks and families, their diet of meat and milk and their aversion of settled life in towns and cities agree in all essentials with the ways and manners of all peoples of the Steppes. Their bellicose

1. *Tafsir XVII*, 62-64 cited by A. J. Wensinek, “Yādjdj-Mādjndj” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. IV p. 1142.

2. A. Von Le Coq *Die Buddhistische sp̄tantike in Mittel-Asien* VI, VII.

3. J. Charpentier “Die ethnographische Stellung der Tocharer”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* Vol. 71 (1917) p 3-8.

4. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* (Loch Classical Library) XXXI, 2, 31.

spirit, lightning tactics, swift movements on horseback, skill in shooting arrows from double-curved bows, relentless ferocity exhibited in drinking the blood of fallen adversaries and making goblets of their skulls recall the practices of the nomads of Eurasian Steppes from time immemorial.<sup>1</sup>

Gog and Magog are Hebrew words meaning all kinds of 'outer barbarians'.<sup>2</sup> In medieval times they give place to *Chin* and *Māchin* and are shown to occupy the whole of eastern Asia.<sup>3</sup> But in the first millenium B. C. and even earlier, the whole of the Eurasian Steppes was dominated by the hordes and tribes of Iranian affinities. Homer described the Cimmerians as inhabiting the extremities of the earth which are shrouded in mist and cloud and where the sun hardly shines.<sup>4</sup> He meant by these regions some parts of the northern coast of the Black Sea.<sup>5</sup> Aeschylus placed Cimmeria in this very region in close proximity to the Palus Maeotis and the Bosphorus. At the time of Herodotus it teemed with toponyms derived from the settlement of the Cimmerians, who occupied the whole of south Russia about 800 B. C. and from there, either alone or in association with other tribes, crossed the Danube and the Thracian Bosphorus, and carried their arms in Asia Minor as the poet Callinus attests. They also spread in Transcaucasia towards the end of the eighth century and attacked the kingdom of Urartu and later concluded an alliance with the latter and threatened Assyria. A. V. Bashmakov<sup>6</sup> identifies these people with the Circassians and M. I. Rostovtzeff treats them as akin

1. Rene Grousset, *L'Empire des Steppes* Ch. I; George Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* pp. 48-48; T. Talbot Rice *The Scythians* pp. 57-62; Rabula Sankrityayana, *Madhya-Asia ka Itihāsa* (History of Central Asia) Vol. I pp. 73-75; 79-80; V. Gordon Childe 'Scythia,' *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1959) Vol. XX pp. 235-238

2. Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Quran* p. 288.

3. Joseph Needham, *Science and Civilization in China* Vol. I p. 168.

4. Homer, *Odyssey* XI, 14-19 cited in H. F. Tozer, *A History of Ancient Geography* p. 30-31.

5. Gladstone, *Homer and the Homeric Age* Vol. III p. 294.

6. A. V. Bashmakov, *Cinquante siècles d' évolution ethnique autour de la Mer Noire* p. 40

to the Thracians.<sup>1</sup> G. Vernadsky considers them Aryans or Indo-Europeans<sup>2</sup>, and G. Rawlinson regards them Scythians, holding that *gimiri* is a Babylonian transcript of the Iranian word *Saka* which perhaps originally signified a 'nomad' or a 'wanderer'.<sup>3</sup> H. W. Bailey thinks that the word *Saka* is the adjective of Iranian *√sak* 'to be powerful, skilful' used as an epithet of 'men'.<sup>4</sup> One of the main divisions of the Celtic people bore the name of Cymry as its special designation.<sup>5</sup> The place-names *Cambria* (ancient Wales) and *Cumberland* in England, *Cambrai* and *Quimper* in France, *Cambrill* in Spain and *Coimbra* in Portugal are connected by Rawlinson with the Cimmerians who formed part of the Celts and spread over the whole of Western Europe.<sup>6</sup>

The Cimmerians dominated over south Russia from cir. 1000 B. C. to 700 B. C. till they were over-thrown and ousted by fresh hordes from the east called Scythians. Some scholars regard the Scythians as Tartars or Mongols<sup>7</sup>, some treat them of slavic origin<sup>8</sup> and others consider them Indo-Europeans.<sup>9</sup>

- 
1. M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* p. 39.
  2. G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* p. 49.
  3. G. Rawlinson *History of Herodotus* Vol. III p. 180.
  4. *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Iranistik* (Leiden-Köln 1958) p. 133
  5. Niebuhr, *History of Rome* (Eng. Tr.) Vol II. p. 520.
  6. G. Rawlinson *History of Herodotus* Vol. III p. 182.
  7. Niebuhr, 'Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der Skythen, Gaten und Sarmaten' *Kleine Schriften* p. 362; Thirlwall, *History of Greece* Vol. II p. 219; Grote, *History of Greece* Vol. III p. 322.
  8. Grigoriev Zabelin, Illovaiskii hold this view of Slavic origin. Their works are cited in E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* pp. 36 ff. Niederle sees the Slavs in the Neuri, Budini and Ploughman. Scythians (*Manuel de l'Antiquité Slave* (1922) cited by Entwistle, *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1944) p. 40). Derjavin considers the Slavs as the descendants of the Scythians. (Rabula Sankrityayana, *Madhya Asia Ka Itihāsa* Vol. II p. 563) Vernadsky derives the name of Russia from the Iranian words *ors* or *uors* (white), *rukhs* (light) which were implicit in the names of the Sarmatian tribes of Aorsi and Roxolani that were akin to the Scythians (*Ancient Russia* p. 97) Thus the name of Russia derived from *ors* (white) recalls 'Svetadvipa' of Indian Purāṇic records. (*Brahmaṇḍa Purāṇa*, 34, 465; *Agni Purāṇa* 107, 7). Scythian survivals in Russia are noticeable in peasant art, embroideries, wood-carvings pottery and toys.

9. K. Müllenhoff *Deutsche Altertums Kunde* Vol. II; M. I. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.* Jacob Grimm, *Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache* Vol. I P. 231

In the last group of scholars some hold that they were of Iranian stock and others suggest that they were akin to the Ugio-Altaians.<sup>1</sup> However, there is general agreement among scholars that the language spoken by the Scythians was basically Iranian, more closely allied to Avestic than to ancient Persian,<sup>2</sup> though Ugian elements also crept into it. In the eastern section of the Steppes, the Scythians mixed with the Mongols which accounts for the Mongoloid features of a chieftain and a woman buried in mound 2 at Paziik, and an old man interred in a grave at Shibe in the Altai.<sup>3</sup> As a result of this miscegenation and intermixture some auxiliary Scythian hordes came to consist of Ugians and Mongols. In the Altaic and West Siberian regions the Iranian element shaded gradually off into the Mongoloid stock and vice-versa. Yet the main ruling Scythian horde remained Iranian in blood and speech.

In the beginning of the first millenium B. C. there was one of those nomadic upsurges at the eastern extremity of the Steppes which touched off a vast völkerwanderung over the Eurasian heartland. The hordes living there which the Chinese called Hiung-nu began to expand and conquer all around and dislocated their western neighbours who began to march westwards. The Hiung-nu invaded China also and caused serious damage and destruction there. The Chinese soon took the offensive and lashed out against these nomads. The reverses inflicted by the emperor Suan (827-781 B. C.) on them drove them towards the west. They fell upon the tribes and hordes living there who in turn clashed against their western

---

George Rawlinson *History of Herodotus* pp 187 etseq. Paul Pelliot, *Influences Iraniques en Asie Central et en Extrême Orient* (Paris 1911); Berthold Laufer, *Sino-Iranica* p. 185; Sten Konow, *Kharoshti Inscriptions* (C. I. I. Vol. II: Part I) p. XVI.

1. Geza Nagy, *Neprafzi Füstök* (Budapest 1895) no. 3 cited in T. Talbot Rice, *The Scythians* p. 39; E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*.

2. M. Vasmer, *Untersuchungen über die ältesten Wohnsitze der Slaven, Die Iranien in süd Russland* (Leipzig 1923).

3. S. V. Kiselev, *Drevnaya istoria ujnoi Sibiri* (Ancient History of Southern Siberia) p. 182.

neighbours. Thus a train of tribes was set in movement which agitated and convulsed the whole of Eurasian world. About 800 A. D. a severe drought in the steppes accelerated this tribal flux and unrest.<sup>1</sup> The Massagatae, living to the north of the Oxus, assaulted the Scythians who lashed out against the Eastern Cimmerians. The Cimmerian infantry was no match for the Scythian cavalry equipped as it was with saddles and probably things acting as leather stirrups which were unknown even to the Greeks and the Romans. A scene of the Scytho-Cimmerian war is represented on the Scythian bow-case found in the Solokha Kurgan where two soldiers are shown to be fighting on foot with a Scythian horseman.<sup>2</sup> The axe and dagger of the Cimmerians were also nothing in comparison with the Scythian arrows shot from bows on horseback. As a result, the Cimmerians descended through the Dariel pass into Urartu. The Scythians continued the march, one section crossing either the Jaxartes or the Volga and pressing into South Russia where it conquered the Western Cimmerians, and another turning aside from the Dariel pass and swooping down the Derbend defile on the shores of Lake Urmia at the time of Sargon of Assyria.<sup>3</sup> The Assyrians set them against the Cimmerians who hovered over their kingdom. Being defeated, the Cimmerians retreated over the Phrygian territory of King Midas, overran Lydia, sacked the Greek coastal cities and vanished into the West.

This movement of the Scytho-Iranian tribes about the commencement of the first millenium B. C. which anticipated their similar invasions towards the close of that millenium had serious repercussions on Iran, India, Assyria, Ionia and South Russia. In India there was a Scythian immigration long before the time of Pāṇini (5th-4th cent. B. C.) which caused a tribal welter in the Panjab.<sup>4</sup> In Iran the Scythian elements predo-

1. Ellsworth Huntington, *The Pulse of Asia* p. IX

2. M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks* p. 40 Table XXI.

3. T. Talbot Rice, *The Scythians* p. 44.

4. Jean Przyluski, 'Nouveau aspects de l'histoire des Scythes' *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles* Vol. 42 (1937) page 209, 218-223.

minated on the eve of the foundation of the Achæmenian empire.<sup>1</sup> In the West the Cimmerians succumbed to their incursions and the sedentary communities of the Middle East felt their impact. They occupied Urartu under Partatua and his son Madyes, setting up their capital at Sakiz and controlled the territory upto the Halys. They aided the Assyrians against the Medes, and flushed with victory, swept across Syria and Judaea, and reached Philistaea in Egypt where king Psametek paid them off. But the joint forces of the Medes and the Babylonians who had overthrown the Assyrian empire pushed them out from Persia towards Caspiana where they mixed with the Dahae, and became the nucleus of the Parthians in later times. Some went towards Russia, and others fled towards India accounting for the Scythian admixture in the Scythe-Dravidians.

As a result of these invasions and incursions, the Scythians became predominant in the Eurasian world and were identified by the peoples of settled communities with all the nomads of the Steppes. The Greeks applied this word Scyth or Saka or Saha to all the nomads roving from the frontiers of China to the vicinity of the Carpathians.<sup>2</sup> The 'Scythian Scythia' of Strabo,

Les Salva, *Journal Asiatique* (1929) pp. 312-325 'les-oudoumbars', *Journal Asiatique* (1926) pp. 1-20; V. S. Agrawala, *India as known to Pāṇini* pp. 67-68; Buddha Prakash, *Mahābhārata, A Historical Study*. (in Hindi) Triveni Prakashana, Allahabad pp. 54-55.

1. O. C. Cameron, *A History of Early Iran* pp. 183-84 R. Ghirshman *Iran* pp. 105, 107, 109-110, T. T. Rice, *The Scythians* p. 45.

2. V. Gordon Childe, 'Scythia' *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1959 edition) Vol. XX, p. 235-238. Sten Konow, *Kharosthi Inscriptions* (O. I. I. Vol. II Part I) pp. XVI-XVII, Herodotus mentions the Sakai together with the Bactrians (I, 153; VII, 64; IX, 113) and with India (VII, 9) and (III, 93) as forming the fifteenth nomos of the Persian Empire together with the Kaspioi. *Anabasis* III, 8, 3; VII, 10, 5) speaks of them in connection with the Bactrians and Sogdians; Curtius Rufus (V, 9, 5; VI, 3, 9) with the Indians; Strabo (XI, 8, 2) and Pliny locate them beyond the Jaxartes, and the former states (XI, 6, 2) that the ancient historiographers of the Hellenes called the tribes beyond the Caspian sea partly Sakai, partly Messagetæ, without having accurate knowledge about them and in another place (XI, 8, 2), that beginning from the Caspian Sea, most of the Scythians were called Daki, farther to the east, however,

the '*Scythia*' *intra et extra Imaus* of Ptolemy, and the '*Asiatic Scythia*' of Herodotus refer to the vast Eurasian Steppes which have been the cradle of the Scythians. In course of time however the name 'Scythia' was confined to the Steppes from the Carpathians to the Don. The 'Lesser Scythia' of Strabo and 'Scythia' proper of Herodotus was a square of some 440 miles, the southern side of which was bounded by the Euxine between the mouth of the Danube and the Palus Maotis, the eastern side by the Don or Tanais from its rise out of the Lake Ivan, the northern side by a line drawn from this lake to that out of which the Tyras or Dniester flows, and the western side by a line from thence to the Danube. Thus Scythia comprised the modern regions of Kherson, Poltava, Ekaterinoslav, Kharkov, Kursk, the Don Cossacks, Voronez, Riazan, Orlov, Tula, Mogilev, Tchernizov, Minsk, Volnnia (a part), Kiev, Podolsk, Bessarabia, Moldavia and Wallachia.<sup>1</sup> It consisted of the two great basins of the Don and the Dneiper, the minor basins of the Dniester and the Boug and the northern half of the basin of the lower Danube from Orsova to the sea. Among the rivers mentioned by Herodotus the Ister is the Danube, the Porata, the Pruth, the Tyras, the Dniester, the Hypanis, the Boug, the Borysthenes, the Dneiper, the Tanais, the Don, the Gerhus or

---

preferably Massagetae and Sakai. He also informs us that they had occupied Bactria and the best districts of Armenia, which was thence called Sakastene and they had even advanced to the cappadocians where the Persian strategy had annihilated them. According to Megasthenes, the Hemodan mountain separates India in the north from that part of Scythia, which is inhabited by the Scythians called Sakai. Ptolemy includes the Karatai, Komaroi, Komedai, Massagetai, Grynaroi, Skythai, Toornai and Byltai among the Sakas. He locates their country between 35° and 49° N and between 125° and 143° E. Ktesias mentions Roxanake as their royal city, which name is present in the modern Roshan.

1. H. F. Tozer, *A History of Ancient Geography* p. 85 G. Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus* Vol. III p. 205 J. Oliver Thompson, *History of Ancient Geography* p. 60. According to Childe, Scythia means on one hand the Steppe from the Carpathians to the Don, and on the other the unknown regions of northern Asia. He observes that Herodotus tries to confine the word 'Scyth' to a certain race and its subjects but even he seems to slip back into the wide use. (*Encyclopaedia Britannica* Vol. XX p. 235-238).



Hypacyris perhaps the Konka or Konskaya, the Syrgis the Donetz, and the Orarus, probably the Volga.<sup>1</sup> Of the places of Scythia Herodotus mentions only one, Olbia which can be identified with modern Stomogil (Hundred Mounds).

According to Herodotus, the main horde was known as the 'Royal Scythians'. They lived on the other side of the river Girrhos as far east as the sea of Azov and as far south as the Taurida (Crimea). Close to them between the mouth of the Ingulets and the Perekop Isthmus roamed the Scythian-Nomads. West of them between the Ingulets and the Ingul river lived the Scythian Georgoi called Boristhenitae. In their vicinity to the west, in the Bug region, were the Callipidea or Helleno-Scythians and north of them in the northern section of the Bug basin lived the Alazones. Their culture was similar to that of the Scythians except that they sowed cereals. West of the Callippidae on the lower Dniester were the abodes of the Tyritae, and west of them the Getae lived on the lower Danube, and the Agathyrssae in Transylvania. South of the Royal Scythians in the Taurida mountains lived the Tauri, a tribe of warlike brigands. The Maeotians were the closest neighbours of the Royal Scythians in the south-east and controlled the Steppes between the Don and the Volga. The Sindians and Saurmatae were important tribes of their group. Among them women dominated the life of the tribe.

Among the northern neighbours of the Scythians, Herodotus mentions the Alazones, above them the Scythian Aroteres (Plowmen) and to their north the Neuri who shared the Scythian customs. They are to be located in northern Podolia and Volynia, the area of the funeral urns or the cradle of the Proto-Slavs. Near them on the upper Don or Donets were the Budini who are taken to be the ancestors of the Slavs. Herodotus places the Androphagi (cannibals) and Melanchlaeni

---

1. These river names are based on the Iranian word for water *dana-* (ossetic, *don*) the metathesis of which is the Indian *nada* and 'avon' which can perhaps be seen in *Yamunā* also.

(Black Robes) next to the Neuri. They are said to wear the Scythian dress and the latter are known to have the customs similar to them. The former are taken to be the ancestors of the Mordvians (a name derived from the Iranian *mard* meaning man) and located north of the present day Chernigov along the bank of the Desna River; the latter are considered the forbears of the Finnish tribes Meria and Cheremissians living north of Voronezh. In the region of middle Volga and Kama rivers were the abodes of the Thyssagetae. In Bashkiria in southern Ural area lived the Iyicae or the Ugrians.

To the east of the Ural River Herodotus locates the Massagetae, the Issidones, the Arimaspians, the 'Scythian-Apostates' and the Argippaei. The Massagetae inhabited Turkestan, the Issidones originally lived on the river Isset, a tributary of the Tobol and later migrated to Sinkiang. The Arimaspians had their abodes at the foot of the Altai mountains but they were Iranians as their very name meaning "friends of horses" indicates, according to the view of E. Benveniste. The 'Scythian-Apostates' occupied the Akmolinsk area, northern Kazakhstan, and represented those Scythians who stayed on there and did not proceed to the west with the Royal Scythians. The Argippaei were probably in Jungaria and partook of the ethnic features of the Mongols, though they wore the garments of Scythian pattern. Herodotus reports that the unrest of the Arimaspians stirred the Massagetae and the Issidones, one of which drove and pushed the Scythians towards the west. According to Herodotus the Massagetae were Scythians in dress and culture, and the Issidones shared their customs and usages. Thus in his view the whole of the Steppes from the confines of China to the banks of the Danube was full of Scythian nomads who, of course, revealed ethnological and cultural shades and varieties at the extremities of this vast region, but in the main followed an identical way of life. In 512 B. C. when Darius attacked the Scythians, all the neighbouring tribes, the Budini, the Geloni and the Sauromatae helped them. The Neuri, the

Androphagi and the Melanchlaeni stood aloof and were severely punished by the Scythians later on.<sup>1</sup>

According to Herodotus the Royal Scythians consisted of three main hordes ruled by Scopasis, Idanthrysus and Taxacis, names, which, in the opinion of Rawlinson, imply a Scythian root *asi* or *ārśi*.

In the first half of the second century B. C., the Scythians were defeated by the Sarmatians who had started their westward march in the third century B. C., and intensified it in the second, as a result of the concussion in the Steppes caused by the movements of tribes following the expansion of the Hiung-nu. The history of the beginning of the first millenium B. C. repeated itself about 800 years later. The Hiung-nu drove the Yue-Chi from the neighbourhood of Kan-su and Ninghoia towards the west. They plunged into northern Gobi, defeated the Saka tribes living on the upper Ili, Chu and Naryn, but another Saka tribe, the Mu-Sun, again drove them from there towards the west. As a result, the Saka tribes marched towards Bactriana, put an end to the kingdom of the Indo-Greeks and swooped upon the frontiers of India, with the Yue-Chi following them. Somewhat earlier, the Parthians seized Iran and clashed with the Scyths, and the Sarmatians rushed towards the west and overthrew the Scythians of South Russia.

The Sarmatians were Iranian in race and resembled the Scythians in speech and culture.<sup>2</sup> They improved the technique

---

1. M. I. Rostovtzeff offers a new interpretation of the invasion of the Scythians by Darius. His object was only to make an impressive raid as a proof of his power and to deal one or two heavy blows at the Scythian army (*Iranians and Greeks* p. 84) But the actual words of Herodotus are as follows.—“the desire seized him (Darius) to exact vengeance from the Scyths, who had once in days gone by invaded Media and defeated those who met them in the field and so began the quarrel” (G. Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus* Vol. III p. 1)

The identification of the place-names and tribal names of Scythia given by Herodotus are after Minns, (*op. cit* pp 101-107); Vernadsky, *op. cit* pp 80-88; Rawlinson, *op. cit* Vol. III pp 205; Grousset, *L'Empire des Steppes* pp. 37-42.

2. M. I. Rostovtzeff, 'The Sarmatae and the Parthians' *Cambridge Ancient History* Vol. XI Ch. III pp. 92-103.

of horsemanship by inventing the metal stirrup which gave them a decided superiority over the Scythians. Among them women had the foremost place both at home and in war. No Sarmatian girl could wed until she had killed a foe in battle. These women-warriors probably gave rise to the legend of Amazons or *Strirājya*. The Scythians called them "the lords of men."<sup>1</sup> A grave at Zemo-Avchala, eight miles or so from Tiflis, belongs to a woman-warrior of this type.<sup>2</sup> The Sarmatians were intimately connected with the Kushans as their costumes and armaments indicate. Among them the bow and arrow no longer played the important role of former times, and the lance, the long sword and the heavy scale or ring armour began to be prominently employed. These armaments are also noticeable on the effigies of Wima Kadphises and Kaniska, particularly the statue of the latter.<sup>3</sup>

The major Sarmatian tribes were the Iazygians, the Roxolani, the Siracae and the Aorsi. The Iazygians settled on the shore of the Black Sea between the mouth of the Dniester and the lower Danube in the region later known as Bessarabia. The Roxolani settled to the east of the Iazygi between the Dneiper and the Don. The name of this tribe is derived from the Iranian *rukhs* meaning light, and signifies the 'Light Alans'. East of the Roxolani on the lower Don river were the abodes of the Aorsi. Their name is based on the Iranian word *ors* or *uers* meaning 'white'. Next to the Aorsi to the south-east of the Sea of Azov were the Siracae<sup>4</sup>. These Sarmatian tribes were overthrown by the Alans who controlled the steppe area from the lower Don to the lower Volga from the first to the fourth centuries A. D. Ammianus Marcellinus' remark about them shows that they represented the whole Scytho-Iranian population of the Steppes. He observes :—

- 
1. T. Talbot Rice, *The Scythians* p. 48.
  2. This discovery was made by G. K. Nikoradze, Rice, *op. cit* p. 49.
  3. Ludwig Bachhofer, 'On the Greeks and Sakas in India' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol. 61 (1941) pp 247-249. R. Ghirshman, *Bégram, Recherches archéologiques et historiques sur les Kouchans* p. X.
  4. G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* p. 89.

"The Halani inhabit the measureless wastes of Scythia --- They mount to the east, divided into populous and extensive gentes, they reach far into Asia and as I have heard, stretch all the way to the river Ganges, which flows through the territories of India and empties into the southern ocean."<sup>1</sup>

In the west the Alans are known as the *As* (*Asy* or *Iasy*, the forefathers of the Ossetians). Many toponyms in the steppes of northern Taurida bear the impress of their name. Several villages within the former Eupatoria and Perekop districts have *as* as their name or a part of it e. g., Biuk-as, Kuchuk-as, Teiekh-as etc. There is also a river *As* in the northern part of the Peninsula. The name of the Gothic city of Doras (*dor-as*) points in the same direction.<sup>2</sup>

Another group of the *As* lived on the Caucasian side of the Bosphorus where the name of the hill *Assodag* (*As-Dag*) in the Kuban delta near Taman and the name of the town of Malorosa provide evidence of it. This name *as* is a form of *asi*, *isi*, *rsi*, *uorsi* etc. which are attested in Central Asia. As Ammianus Marcellinus remarks, the Alans ruled on the Ganges in India. We know that the Kuṣāṇas ruled there. Hence it follows that the Kuṣāṇas and the Alans were one and the same. Since the Alans were called *As*, the Kuṣāṇas must also be given this name. The Kuṣāṇas were a class of the Yue-Chi. Accordingly the name *As* comes to be applied to the Yue-Chi. This strengthens the theory of the identity of the Yue-Chi and the ṛśikas (*as*, *asi*, *isi*) mentioned in Indian texts, particularly, the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>3</sup> Charpentier sees in the name of the Wusun or Osum this ethnic appellation *as* or *asi*.<sup>4</sup> Thus it is

1. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* XXXI, 2, 13-16 translated by J. O. Rolfe in 'Loeb Classical Library'

2. G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* pp 106, 143.

3. *Mahābhārata* II, 27, 22, 26.

लोहान्परमकम्बोजानृषिकानुत्तरानपि ।

सदित्तास्तान्महाराज व्यजयत्पाकशासनिः ॥

In the critical edition the variants of *rsi* are *isi* and *isi*

4. Jarl Charpentier, *op. cit.*, p. 359.

clear that the Yue Chi, Wu-sun, Kushans, Alans and Sarmatians belonged to one and the same Iranian group bearing the name *as* or *Ora* (white, light).

Haloun has shown that the word Yue-Chi must have been pronounced *Zgudja* which he compares with *ashkuzai*, the name of the Scythians in Asian records, and thus establishes the identity of the Yue-Chi and the Sakas<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand Otto Maenchen-Helfen equates the word Yue-Chi with Kusa. He has shown that the Yue-Chi people were in occupation of the northern states of the Tarim basin long before the foundation of the Kuṣāṇa empire, as the toponyms Kutsi, Ku-Sbih and Kao-Chang indicate.<sup>2</sup> He also holds that the Europeid element was present among the Hiung-nu, T'u-yu-hun etc. According to the *Chin-Shu* the Hiung-nu soldiers massacred by Shih Min in Chao in 349 A. D. had high noses and full beards. Likewise the barbarian, whom Ho Ch'u-ping's horse tramples under his hoof in a stone figure, has a moustache and a full beard. Maenchen-Helfen even conjectures that the word *Hun* is an Iranian word meaning 'powerful' or 'skilful'.<sup>3</sup> Laufer and Pelliot also hold that the Iranian nomads dominated the Steppes of Central Asia up to the borders of China and formed part of the tribal confederacy of the Hiung-nu, to whom they contributed many items of their dress, department and armaments.<sup>4</sup>

In the second century, Ptolemy called Sineria in Central Asia Scythia. He placed Chauranaei Scythae, Chaetae, Scythae, Issidon-Scythae, Horse eater-Scythae and Abii Scythae beyond the Himalayas. The last are the Abii praised by Greek authors for their justice and cheerfulness.<sup>5</sup>

1. Gustav Haloun, 'Zur Ue-tsi Frage', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* Vol. 91 (1937) p. 316.

2. Otto J. Maenchen-Helfen, 'The Yueh-Chih Problem'

3. Reexamined 'Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 65 (1917) p. 77.

4. Otto J. Maenchen-Helfen, 'The Ethnic name Hun,' *Studia Sinica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata* (1959) pp 237-238.

5. J. Oliver Thompson, 'History of Ancient Geography pp 309-310.

The above survey of the history of the Eurasian Steppes in the first millenium B. C. shows that the Scythians of Iranian race were predominant there in this period.<sup>1</sup> They roved, moved, hunted and grazed their horses and cattle in the vast plains from Kan-su to Crimen. The exigencies of nomadic life instilled into their spirit a strong penchant for war. Occasional droughts in the Steppes or pressures of powerful neighbours forced them to lash out against other tribes or raid and ravage the rich countries of the settled peoples. Very easily their hunting parties or roving hordes assumed the form of armies and fell upon those who came in the way. Their simple manners, light equipment, astute horsemanship, sure shot and ferocious charge made them invincible vis-à-vis their heavily equipped, ease-loving, peace-longing sedentary neighbours. Their sudden sallies ranked as divine scourges and natural calamities. Hence the people of Syria and Israel gave them the name of Gog and Magog.

It is clear from the above discussion that Gog-Magog initially meant the Scythians.<sup>2</sup> Alexander who started his struggle with the northern Scythians by a lightning blow across the Danube, and completed it by building a fortress on the Jaxartes against the Sacae, was credited by posterity with the building of a gate of iron and brass to hold the terrible Gog-Magog in check. Later on whenever any people from the Eurasian Steppes emerged and invaded the sedentary commu-

1. The Scythian Royal tombs (Kurgans) from Pazirik Katanda, Shibe and Karatol in Siberia upto Maikop, Kelermis, Kul Oba and Semibratnii in Transcaucasia and Chertomlyk, Melgunov and Voronezh etc. in south Russia with almost uniform pomp, style and ceremonies show the ascendancy of the Scythians in the whole of this region. Rice, *The Scythians* pp 92-123; M. P. Griaznov, 'The Pazirik Burial of Altai,' *American Journal of Archaeology* Vol. 37 (1933) pp. 30-44.

2. Francois Lenormant, 'Gog et Magog', *Revue des sciences et des lettres* (1882) p. 9; A. K. Anderson *Alexander's Gate, Gog-Magog and the Inclosed Nations*. (1932) pp 15-20, 291; Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, 'Shakhsīyat Dhu'l-Qarnain al-mazkur fil Qur-ān' (the personality of Dhu'l-Qarnain in the Qur-an) (in Arabic), *Thaqāfat-ul-Hind* September 1950) pp 10-40, especially the section on *Sado Yafūj-Mājūj* pp. 25-40.

nites of the civilized zones, they were identified with Gog and Magog.<sup>1</sup> The idea of Alexander's gate was itself mixed with that of the Great Wall of China. In medieval and early modern times Gog and Magog figure on all maps. The effigies of Gog and Magog stand in the guild-hall of London to act as porters at the gates after the slaying of their brethren by Brute and his companions.<sup>2</sup>

The Gānaga and Magaga of the *Bhaviṣṣapurāṇa* stand for Gog and Magog and represent the Scythians. They are the Indian versions of these Semetic and Syriac ideas about these nomadic people.

The fourth tribe of Śākadvīpa is *Maṇḍaga*, the variants of which are *Nandaka*, *Madaka* *Mandaka* and *Manaka*. Mandaka is a nasalised form of *Madaka* which stands for the Iranian tribe *Māda*. In the Babylonian versions of this word a nasal is sometimes inserted in it. For instance, in the chronicle of the "*Fall of Nineveh*" and other Neo-Babylonian texts the name *Māda* appears as *Maīda*. Section 54 of the Hittite Code also contains the name Ummān Manda. The country south-east of the Urmiah Lake, later included in Ajerbaijan, was also known as *Man* from which the Greek *Mantianē* and *Matiene* were derived.<sup>3</sup> The *Māda* or the *Medes* were a group of tribes which the Assyrians described as mighty, distant, and eastern. In later times the regions of Hamadan, Nihawand, Isfahan, Ray and Ajerbaijan came to be known as Media. About 900 A. D. particularly 843 B. C. we begin to hear of Aryan or Iranian peoples in Assyrian records.

The Aryan tribes entered into the Iranian highland from the northern plains through the wide natural gate near Sarakhs

---

1. Oman, *On the Writing of History* pp. 268-9; Olschki, *Marco Polo's Successors* pp 2, 62, Kimble, *Geography in the Middle Ages* (1938) J. K. Wright, *Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades* (1915) C. R. Beazley, *Dawn of Modern Geography* (300 A. D -1420 A. D.) Vol. I.

2. *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1959 edition) Vol. X. p. 475.

3. Ernst Herzfeld, *Zoroaster and his world* Vol. II, p. 427.



in the valley of the Herat and Mashhad rivers. The tribes which immigrated early adopted the settled way of life earlier and those following them or left behind remained in the nomadic state and adopted sedentary culture somewhat later. Hence the Medes continued to stick to old habits of nomadic life up to quite later periods.

The aforesaid discussion shows that the Purāṇas and epics grouped the Gog and Magog with the Maga and Mada. Since the Mada were an Iranian tribe and Maga represented a class among the Iranian people, it is clear that the geographers of the Purāṇas were dealing with Iranian peoples *par excellence* in connection with the ethnography of Śākadvīpa. The bracketing of Mada and Maga with Gog and Magog conclusively establishes that the latter also partook of Iranian elements. In fact, all these four tribes are described as classes of the same people who inhabited Śākadvīpa. Thus there is no doubt that the Gog and the Magog were Iranians like the Mada and the Maga. Though these people led a nomadic life they were not devoid of social organization. Herodotus has noted that in Scythia there were agriculturists, artisans and slaves besides the reigning Royal Scythians. The wonderful artistic taste of these people presupposed the existence of a flourishing artisan class, though their demarcation in the society might not have been very clear-cut. The Indian writers with their flair for well-defined distinctions and familiarity with the orderly organization of the four economic functions in India, could easily transplant the same notions into the society of the nomads. Hence they called the Magas the Brāhmaṇas or priestly class, the Magaga the Rājanya or royal tribe, the Gānaga the Vaiśyas or artisan class, and the Maṇḍagas as Śūdras or the servile people. But they realised that there was no external pressure to maintain these functional divisions. Rather they existed as a result of the natural working of the social system.<sup>1</sup> The distinction between the ruler and the ruled was very thin. The Royal

Scythians (Saka) led a kind of life which other tribes and peoples under them also shared.<sup>1</sup> The Purāṇas make a notable contribution to the ethnography of the Steppes by demonstrating that the conceptions of Gog and Magog represented the Iranians who remained in the nomadic state, and constituted the Scythians.

As seen above, Śākadvīpa surrounds the 'Ocean of Milk' (*Kṣīra-Sāgara*) according to Indian conception. This *Kṣīrasāgara* is the same as *Shīrwān* mentioned by Marco-Polo and identified with the Caspian sea.<sup>2</sup> According to Muslim geographers a region on the western shore of the Caspian Sea was known as *Shīrwān*. The capital of this region is called *Shāberan* (Shawerān) in the *Hudūd-al-Ālam*. *Iṣṭakhrī* states that the road from *Bardha'a* led via *Shīrwan* and *Shamākhīyā* to *Deibend*. *Hamd-Allāh Qazwīnī* informs us that the land from the *Kura* to *Derbend* was included in *Shirwan*. The rulers of this region bore the title of *Shirwānshah* from pre-Mohammadan times.<sup>3</sup> A river in *Kurdistan* was called *Shirwan* and in *Iran* a river which rose in the hills of *Bazrang* district and flowed through the district of *Fuzruk* south east of *Arrajan* was named as *Shīn*. A river in *Russia* bears the name *Molochnaya* from the bank of a tributary of which called *Tokmak* up to the lower *Dneiper* stretched the realm of the Royal Scythians or *Scoloti* in ancient times. This name *Molochnaya* is derived from 'Molocho' meaning 'milk' in Russian and implies the conception of *Kṣīroda-Sāgara*.

1. *Ibid* VI, 12, 20

शाको नाम महाराज तस्य द्वीपस्य मध्यगः ।

Variant: शाको नाम महाराज तस्य प्रजाः सदातुगाः ।

or शाको नाम महाराज यजास्तस्य सदातुगाः ।

2. *The Travels of Ser Marco-Polo*, translated by Sir Henry Yule Vol. I, p. 59; *Satyasrava, Sakas in India*, p. 7; V. S. Agrawala, 'Mahabharata—a cultural commentary, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. 37 (1956) p. 10.

3. *Hamd Allah Qazwini, Nuzhat-al-Qulub* ed. Le Strange p. 92; B. Dorn, *Geschichte Shirwans unter den Statthaltern und Chanen*, G. Le Strange, *The lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, pp. 179-181.

In the *Avestā* the earth, *Prθivē*, (*Pr̥thvī*) is described as round and encompassed by a sea, *Zrayo vurukrtam*, which is identified with the Caspian Sea by Bartholomae. The Iranian Urheimat was the land (*Dvīpa*) between the rivers Ranha and Vahvi, encircled by the *Zrayo vurukrtam*. Ranha first signified the Volga and later stood for the Araxes or Jaxartes. Vahvi is the same as Vahi or Valhi and denotes the river Oxus (Wakhs or Vakšu). In ancient times the Oxus discharged into the Caspian sea. It filled the depression or Sarykamysh, flowed through the bed of the Uzbōi south-east of the gap in the Balkhan hills, over 100 miles south-east of Krasnovodsk, and fell into the Caspian opposite the group of islands called Aghyrtcha. This continued to be the position of the Oxus up to the Mongol period, as we learn from Yāqut, Mustawfi, Hāfiz Ābiū and Ruy Couzalez de Clavijo. Abul Ghāzi, a native of Urganj states that thirty years before his birth, that is, in 1576 the course of the Oxus finally changed towards the Aral Sea. Earlier in 1558 Anthony Jenkinson travelling from Russia to Khiva noted that the Oxus discharged into the Aral. This shift seems to have taken place in the sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

The Caspian Sea has also undergone very drastic and significant changes in course of time. In earliest time it extended much further north than it does at present while eastwards its extent was very much greater. It included not only the present sea of Aral and what is now the intervening desert, but also passed still further to the east to a distance which is not yet clearly determined.<sup>2</sup> Patrocles described the Caspian as opening into the northern ocean. Naturally therefore the Oxus and the Jaxartes both joined the Caspian in ancient times.

In the *Avestā* the expression '*Vəjo Vahviyā dathiyāya*' signifies the lower course of the Oxus marked by the bed of the

---

1. G. Le Strang, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* pp. 453; Tarn, 'Patrocles and the Oxus-Caspian Trade Route, *Journal of Hellenic Society* Vol. XXI pp 10 ff.

2. P. Giles 'Indo-Europeans' *Encyclopaedia Britannica* Vol. XII p. 263,

Uzbi, for here the river torrentially sallies forth and overflows its bounds (the idea of *vəjo* or *vəga*). The country called '*Airyānem vəjō Vahyivā dāthyāya*' is the Aryan homeland in the region of the overflow of the Oxus. It is '*Eranvej*' the urceimat of the Iranians<sup>1</sup>. In the Arsacid and Sassanid period, the *aryānām vəjō* did not mean a distinct region, but the mythical homeland as a whole, the Duab of the Vahvī and Ranhā, regarded as the country of the golden age. In *Yasht* 5, 9, 17, 19 Hošyanta is described as the King of Eranvej before Yama. His name is derived from *√hā* meaning the pressing of Soma. He is thus associated with Saka Haumavargā. Later Yama according to the *Vendidad* (I, 3) organised a migration of people to the hospitable south to avert the calamity of winter and the pressure of population. After the emigration of these Aryans from these regions, other tribes and peoples occupied it which the former classed as Anāryans. Subsequently the positive name Turya supplanted the negative name Anārya, and the very homeland of the Āryas, and the (Eranvej) was considered the cradle of their enemies first *Anerān*, then *Tūrān*. In the Avesta there is hardly any reference to Sakā though in *Yasht* XIII, 143-144 there is an enumeration of the Āryans, Tūryans, Sarima, Saina and Dāha. As Nyberg has shown, the Turya and the Sarimā stand for the Scythians.<sup>2</sup> In Achæmenian times this region was peopled by the Sakas and Saka Tigrakhaudā. In course of time these Sakas, like their kith and kin in the earlier period, had to leave this homeland in search of new pastures which they found in Sakastan. F. W. Thomas has shown that the Sakas lived in Sakastan or Seistan long before the reference to their immigration in the 2nd-1st century B C. as a result of the pressure of the Yue Chi in Chinese and Western accounts.<sup>3</sup> The Galcha tribes of the Pamirs and the Baltis of Baltistan are the modern representative

---

1. Ernst Herzfeld, *Zoroaster and his World* Vol II. p. 699.

2. S. Nyberg, *Die Religionen des Alten Iran* p. 251.

3. F. W. Thomas, 'Sakasthāna, where dwelt the Sakas named by Darius and Herodotus' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1906) pp. 181-200.

of these Sakas.<sup>1</sup> Olaf Caroe holds on the authority of Morgenstierne that the language of the Pathans is a Saka dialect introduced from the North. In Pashtu, for example, 'd' is changed into 'l' (Persian *Pidar* (father) : Pashtu *Pīlar* ; Persian *Didan* (to see) : Pashtu *eidal* ; Persian *dukhtar* (daughter) : Pashtu *lur*. Likewise in the names Spalagadama and Spalahora *Spala* stands for *spada* meaning an army.<sup>2</sup>

The Iranian epic conserves the tradition that Sarima, Tūrya and Ārya were the three sons of Thretona.<sup>3</sup> In *Yasht* XIII, 113-123 Arejahwant and Frāīāzi, the two pious sons of Tura, bear purely Iranian names. In *Yasna* (XVI, 12) the family of the Tūīyan Friyāna is particularly praised. The name friyāna (Skt. *Priya*) meaning 'friend' occurs among the Scythians as '*Plianos*'. In *Yasht* (XIII-143), cited above, there is the expression, 'we sacrifice to the Frawaši of the pious men and the pious women of the Aryan, Tuiyan, Sairimyan, Sainyan and Dahyan lands.' Thus it is clear that the Turyans were Iranian in race and no odium attached to the name in the beginning.

In the *Yasht* there are some indications to show that the Turyans represented those sections of the Iranians who kept leading nomadic life. In *Yasht* XVII, 55 they are described as *asu-aspa* 'having swift horses'. *Yasht* XIX, 56-64 relates the attempt of the Tuiyan chief Frarasyan (Afrāsiab) to seize the sovereignty (*Xvarena*) of Iran. In fact *Yasht* (XIX, 93) admits that the *Xvarena* had once belonged to this brigand-chief when he played the part of the defender of Iran against the tyrant Zainigav. According to *Yasht* (V, 57) the descendants of Yaesaka, the lieutenant of Frarasyan occupied the pass of

1. M. Longworth Dames. 'Afghanistan,' *Encyclopaedia of Islam* Vol. II p. 159.

2. Olaf Caroe, *The Pathans* pp. 65-66.

3. In later legends Thretona figures as Feridun and his sons Sarim, Turya and Ārya as Sarm, Tur and Ereo respectively. In the epic of Firdausi the sons of Feridun become Sam, Zal and Rudabeh. (Percy Sykes, *A History of Persia* Vol. I Ch. 12.

Xsathrosuka in Kanha (K'ang of Chinese or Samarkand) on the basis of these data, Geiger has held that the ethnic name *Tur* referred to the people of the Steppes from the Caspian up to the Jaxartes and even beyond. In his opinion this collective name does not denote any ethnographic distinction.<sup>1</sup> Elaborating this study Marquart has proved that the legendary wars of Irān and Turān reflect the struggles between the settled Iranians (who were proud of their superior culture and had monopolised the name *Airyāna*) with the nomadic Massagetae. In the words of this scholar, it is these Scythian nomads who must have taken the name *Tur*. The later migration of peoples have completely changed the ethnical map of Asia and gradually the term *Tura* was transferred to the new enemies of the Iranians, the Sacaraucae, the To-Kharians, the Kuşanae the Khionite and the Turks.<sup>2</sup>

Firdausi treats Turan, the home of *Tur*,<sup>3</sup> as the land of the Turks and the Chinese which was separated from Iran by the Oxus. According to him the kingdom of Afriasiāb extends up to Kibchak and his capital Kang-diz was situated somewhere near China. The Persians called the land beside the Oxus *Mara-i-Turan*. For Arab geographers the land of the Turks began only to the east of the Sir Darya and did not include Transoxiana.<sup>4</sup> But they extend this territory to the Volga in the west which was called *Nahr-i-Turan*. The summer camps of the old Kings of Turan were located at Aiq—tagh identified by Quatremere and Marquart with the Ural mountains.<sup>5</sup> Count Teleki and Prof. Chelnokoy, the fathers of the Pan-Turanian movement in the nineteenth century, rightly

1. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur in Altertum* p. 194.

2. Marquart, *Eranshahr nach der Geographie des ps. Moses Xorēnādi* pp. 155-167. In the *Rg-Veda* (I 36, 18; VI, 45, 1) there is a reference to *Turvāsa*. The name of the priest of Janamejaya, son of Parikṣita, *Turva Kāva-sya*, is reminiscent of the tribe *Turvāsa* (*Bhāgavatapurāṇa* X, 22, 28-29; *Āitareya-Brahmaṇṣa* VIII, 21). In Sanskrit the root *tvar* means 'to hurry' or 'to run swiftly, and *turya* accordingly means a horse.

3. Spiegel, *Iranische Altertumskunde* Vol. I p. 553.

4. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion* Vol. I p. 64

5. Marquart, *ber die Volkstum der Kommanen* p. 138.

conceived of Turan as lying between the Caspian Sea, the Iranian Plateau, the mountains at the sources of Sir Darya and the Irtysh and the plateau of Akmolinsk.<sup>1</sup>

It is clear from the aforesaid discussion that the Iranian nomads who were first called Tur and later known as Saka spread around the Caspian Sea from the Jaxartes-Oxus to the Volga and the Don.

A consideration of the rivers of Śikadvīpa will also shed light on its extent. According to the *Mahābhārata* the rivers Sukumārī, Kumārī, Sītā Kaverakā, Mahānadi, Mañjalā and Ikṣuvardhanikā flow through this region.<sup>2</sup> The name Sītā corresponds to the Chinese Si-to. These words are derived from X-ta (rita) underlying the name yaxrt of Jaxartes<sup>3</sup>. It rises in the plateau south of Issyk Kul lake in the Thatan-Shah. It flows in the west and discharges into the Western Sea (*Puścimodadhī*). To the south of the Jaxartes is the Sughd river which is also called Zarafshān (gold spreader). It starts from the mountain range called Jabal-al-Buttam, the slopes of which were marked with gold and silver mines and iron, quicksilver, copper, lead, naphtha and bitumen deposits. Rosins, turquoises, lignite and sal-ammoniac were the specialities of this region. Rising from a lake near Jan or Jay the river flows by Panjikant, Samarkand and Bokhara and loses itself in the marshes of shallow-lakes in the western desert towards Khwarizm<sup>4</sup>. Its title Zarafshan or 'goldscatterer' is analogous to the name Mañjalā (with water full of gems) mentioned in the epic. To its south is the Oxus with its numerous tributaries including Wakshab.

1. *Turan, ein Landschaftsbegriff* Vol. I p. 65.

2. *Mahābhārata* (Critical edition) VI, 12, 80, Vol. 7 p. 66.

सुकुमारो कुमारो च सीता कवेरका तथा ।

महानदी च कौरव्य तथा मणिजला नदी ॥

इक्षुवर्धनिका चैव तथा भरतसत्तम ।

3. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (1839 p. 193 ; Nandlal Dey, *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India* p. 187.

4. G. Le Strange, *The lands of the Eastern Caliphate* pp. 466-468.

It rises in a glacier among the mountains of the Pamir<sup>1</sup> and after a course of upwards of a thousand miles falls into the Aral Sea now-a days, and used to discharge in the Caspian sea in early times. Its names Vaksu, Vañkṣu, Chakṣu, ikṣu and iṣu agree with Po-tsu of the Chinese and Wukshāb of al-Indrisi. To the west of the Waksh river, and bounded on the south by the Oxus, lay the districts the Arabs called Saghaniyan. Saghaniyan city is probably identical with the modern town of Sar-i-Asya on the upper part of the Saghaniyan river, a tributary of the Oxus, which was also called Nahr Zamil<sup>2</sup>. These names vouch for the location of the Sakas in these regions.

Among the rivers which discharge into the Caspian from the west and the north, the most important is the Volga. In ancient times e. g., in work of Ptolemy it was called *Ra* which gave rise to the Iranian name *Rinā*, probably the Vedic *Rasā* and the Greek name *Ars* or *Aras* used by Aristotle and *Araxes* employed by Herodotus for the Volga. Rawlinson holds that in primitive Scythic the name *Ars* or *Aras* meant 'great' and was given to this river on account of its greatness. In Scythic the word 'aru' means 'maiden' e. g. *Artimpasa*, Etruscan *Ari-timis*, Greek *Artemis* (celestial Venus). This word may also underlie the Greek name of the Volga, *Ars* or *Aras*,

Arab geographers called the Volga Ittil. Later on, it came to be known as Volga, probably on account of the settlement of the Bulgars along its bank, in the opinion of Rabula Sankrityāyana<sup>3</sup>. But, according to Rawlinson, the word Volga meant 'great' in Arian Slavonic, and was used for the river Volga on account of its greatness.<sup>4</sup> It had the same sense

1. Lord Curzon, 'The Pamirs and the sources of Oxus' *Geographical Journal* (1890) p. 44; Wood, *Oxus* pp 232-233; *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society* Vol. X pp 122-123. In a passage of the *Mahābhārata* Jambū-nadi takes the place of the Oxus (E. W. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology* p. 5.

2. Le Strange, *op. cit.* p. 439.

3. Rabula Sankrityayana, *Madhya Asia ka Itihāsa* (History of Central Asia) in Hindi Vol. II p. 71.

4. George Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus* Vol. III p. 9.



as the Scythian word *Aras*. Thus in his opinion the use of Volga for *Aras* was merely a change of synonyms of two different languages. It is also not unlikely that the name of Volga is derived from the Russian word *Volkā* (Sanskrit *Vṛka*) meaning a 'wolf', with which the Scythian *Neuri*, the ancestors of the Slavs were intimately associated in legends reported by Herodotus. The main tributary of this river is *Kama* which joins it near *Bulgar*. It appears that this river *Kama* and the river *Ra* or *Aras* were transcribed in the epic as *Kumāri*. It is also likely that 'Kumāri' is the translation of the Scythic word 'αια' meaning a 'maiden', which probably underlay the Greek *Arē* or *Aras*. Another river flowing from the west and discharging into the Caspian is *Kuma* which also probably underlies the name *Kumāri*. In order to distinguish the *Kama-ra* or *Kama Volga* from the *Kuma* both of which were transcribed as *Kumāri* the prefix 'su' was added to one of them. Hence we get two river names *Sukumāri* and *Kumāri* in the epic. It is significant that the Russians call the Volga '*Krasavitsai*' which has the same meaning as *Sukumāri* (a beautiful damsel). As regards the river *Kāveraka* it appears to represent the *Kura* River which flows into the Caspian from the west. This river name seems to have been in use over a fairly wide area as the name *Kavir* given to the salt marshes of inner Iran indicates.

While enumerating the rivers of Śākadvīpa, the epic mentions the *Mahānadi* also, as seen above. We have shown in an earlier part of this study that the names of the Russian rivers *Don*, *Donetz*, *Dnieper*, *Dniester* & *Danube* are derived from the Iranian *dan* and the Ossetic *don* meaning water.<sup>1</sup> The metathesis of *dan* or *don* is *nada*. In India this metathesis of this Aryan word has been in use. Thus the *nadi* or great *nadi* (*mahānadi*) located by the epic in Śākadvīpa represents the great river *Don* which flows into the sea of *Azov*. The Iranian nomads *Cimmerians*, *Scythians* and *Sarmatians*—had their settlements along this river from very early times. Herodotus makes it the eastern boundary of *Scythia*.

---

1. G. Vernadsky, *Antient Russia* p. 96,

Corresponding to the valleys of the rivers mentioned above were the seven regions (vaiṣas) of Śākadvīpa. *Sukumāra* and *Kaumāra* are manifestly the valleys of the Sukumāri and the Kumāri or the Volga and the Kuma rivers, *Maṇikāncana* is the Valley of the Maṇijalā or the Zarafshan River; *Maudāki* seems to be a variant of *Mandaga*, a tribe of Śākadvīpa identified with the Māda, and thus signifies Media, *Kumudottara* represents the Komedoi of the Greek writers which extended from The Oxus to the river Karategin, *Mahākāśa* or *Mahākośa* stands for Akhase which the classical writers place in Scythia and *Mahāpuruṣa* suggests the idea of fabulous peoples of abnormal sizes mentioned by Greek writers. Among the mountains of this region *Dugaśaila* represents the Caspian gates, *Kesara* is probably the Zagros Range, *Jaladhara* and *Raivata* are the highlands of the Kuma and Volga regions, *Meru* and *Malaya* are the Pamirs and the neighbouring mountains and *Śyāma* is the general name of northern mountains.

The discussion of the rivers of Śākadvīpa shows that it extended from the Sir-Darya region to that of the Volga and the Don. Thus it included the land on the eastern, western and northern shores of the Caspian sea. It signified the regions to the east of the Caspian which was the early home of the Scythians and the territory to the west and north of this sea through which the Kuma, Kuma and the Volga flow, and where these people had settled as well as the valley of the Don in South Russia where they shifted and supplanted their kith and kin, the Cimmerians. It means both 'Lesser Scythia' and the 'Scythian Scythia' of Strabo.

In the epic the people of Śākadvīpa or Scythia are described as black.<sup>1</sup> According to a Chinese tradition, accepted

1. *Mahābhārata* VI, 12, 17

उत्तरेण तु राजेन्द्र श्यामो नाम महागिरिः ।

मतः श्यामस्त्वमापन्नाः प्रजा जनपदेश्वर ॥

*Ibid* VI, 12, 20

श्यामो यस्मात्प्रवृत्तो वै तस्यै वक्ष्यामि भारत ।

आस्तेऽन भगवान्कृष्णस्तत्कान्त्या श्यामतां गतः ॥

by most of the Steppe peoples, the colour of the north was black.<sup>1</sup> Hence all northern peoples were regarded as black. In fact 'black' became a synonym for 'northern'. For instance, black Bulgars meant the northern Bulgars and Black Ugrians were the northern Ugrians. Similarly the Savarti or Sevordik were called 'Black Sons' in Armenian sources. Here the epic was reproducing a steppian tradition by dubbing the Śakas 'black'. But ignorant of the correct ethnic import of this epithet the author of the epic ascribed the black colour of the Scythians either to the reflection of the swarthy god Kṛṣṇa or the shade of the great Black Mountain (*Syāmo nāma Mahāgiriḥ*). This the Black Mountain was conceived as a possible explanation of the tradition of the black complexion of the Śakas and thus signifies the northern mountains of their country Śākadvīpa. It is significant that in verse VI, 12, 26 of the Great Epic one of the variants of *Śakas* is *Syāma*.

The *Mahābhārata* gives some data about the religion of the people of Śākadvīpa. In VI, 12, 26 it is stated that 'Śaṅkara was worshipped there (*Pūjyate yatra Śaṅkaraḥ*). A variant of *Śaṅkaraḥ* in the critical edition (Vol. III P. 65) is *bhāskaraḥ*, meaning the sun, which is more probable. We learn that the Scythians worshipped Papeus (dyauspitṛ) and Octosyrus (Śvetasūrya) or the sun-god. The Scythian form of the word Octosyrus which has come to us in a Greek garb is 'szaliu' with 'l' for 'i'. He was regarded as the son of 'Divu' (father) and 'Apia' (mother earth).<sup>2</sup> Among the Slavs also the sun was the greatest god on the festivals of which they ate red cakes roasted with butter. Thus it is understandable that Sāmba was asked to repair to Śākadvīpa for inviting the priests who could properly worship the sun-god.

It is conclusively established from the afore-said discussion that Śākadvīpa cannot be located in the Far East as Gerani

---

1. J. J. M. de Groot, *Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens*, (Hunnen) Vol I p. 20.

2. F. G. Bergmans, *Les Scythes* p. 559.

has done but stands for the region to the east, north and west of the Caspian sea up to Southern Russia.<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy in this connection that Śākadvīpa does not figure in early Indian geographical treatises, Brahmanical or Buddhist, where the earth is divided into four regions (dvīpas) only, viz Bhānata Varṣa or Jambūdvīpa, Ketumāla, Bhadrāśvavarṣa and Uttara-Kuru. Later on when the horizons of knowledge widened under the Mauryas and the Kuṣāṇas, the conception of Jambūdvīpa also underwent a transformation. It was no longer confined to the geographical boundaries of India proper but was enlarged to embrace many other regions of Asia, viz *Uttara Kuru* (Ottorocoræ of Ptolemy, perhaps the state of the Tarim basin, Chinese Turkestan), *Harivarṣa*, probably Sughd famous for horses, *Ilāvartavarṣa*, possibly the basin of the Ili river, *Bhadrāśvavarṣa* the Valley of the Sītā (Jaxartes) *Ketumāla*, through which the river Svarakṣā (probably Vaxṣu or Oxus) flows, *Kimpurusa-varṣa* centering round Hemakūta and signifying the Himālayan regions, *Hiranyavarṣa* or Badakshan region noted for mines of precious metals and jewels and *Ramyakavarṣa*, probably the Rami, Ramni Islands (Lambū) in the Far East, besides *Bhāratavarṣa* or India. Thus Jambūdvīpa began to denote Greater India rather than India proper. It became a world by itself having its own sub-continent. Having its centre at Meru, (probably the Pamirs) it projected north wards up to the Ili Basin and stretched southwards to India. In this way India became a part of a bigger geographical unity which began to evolve from the Maurya period and reached its full development in the Kuṣāṇa age. In this age of growing geographical weltanschauung six other continents were conceived in the likeness of Jambūdvīpa. They

1. S. C. Vidyabhūṣana identifies Śākadvīpa with Sogdiana (*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 1902 part I p. 154) He ignores the region to the west and north of the Caspian Sea included in it. H. C. Ray-Chaudhury equates this region with Seistan (*Studies in Indian Antiquities* p. 68). This view is untenable, as no river located in Śākadvīpa flows in it. E. J. Rapson holds that Śākadvīpa was the name of the Lower Indus Valley after the settlement of the Sakas there in the first century B. C. Here again we have to face the same difficulty as in the view of H. C. Ray Chaudhury. No river of Śākadvīpa can be located in this region.

are Plakṣadvīpa, Śālmalīdvīpa, Kuśadvīpa, Krauñcadvīpa, Śākadvīpa and Puṣkaradvīpa.<sup>1</sup> In this study we have examined the data pertaining to Śākadvīpa and shown that they are based on real facts, traditions and informations. These epic and Puranic data about the geography and ethnography of this region tend to throw new light on many obscure and controversial aspects of the Scythian question, as seen above.

### पुराण-रत्नानि

उत्तरं यत्समुद्रस्य हिमाद्रेश्चैव दक्षिणम् ।  
वर्षं तद् भारतं नाम भारती यत्र सन्ततिः ॥  
नवयोजनसाहस्रो विस्तारोऽस्य महामुने ।  
कर्मभूमिरियं स्वर्गमपवर्गं च गच्छताम् ॥

गायन्ति देवाः किल गीतकानि  
धन्यास्तु ते भारतभूमिभागे ।  
स्वर्गापवर्गास्पदमार्गभूते  
भवन्ति भूयः पुरुषाः सुरत्वात् ॥

( विष्णुपु०, २।३।१-२, २४ )

1. Rai Krishna Das 'Puranic Geography' Oaturdvīpa and Sapta-dvīpa, 'Purāṇa Vol. I no. 2 (Feb. 1960) pp. 202-205. H. C. Rāychaudhury, *Studies in Indian Antiquities* pp. 70-74. Most of these continents are named after plants and trees. Accordingly the name Śākadvīpa is also altered as Śākadadvīpa to suit these trends of nomenclature. But the data clearly pertain to the Sakas and Scythia, as seen above.

## प्रह्लादचरितस्य श्रुतिमूलकत्वम्

पं० अनन्तकृष्ण शास्त्री

[In this article the learned writer has shown that the Pahlāda-carita, as it is found in the Purāṇas, is based on the Śruti or Veda. He traces its source in the *Taittirīya-Brahmaṇa*, and discusses its further amplification (or upaḥimhaṇa) in the Purāṇas. It is in respect of the Pahlāda-carita and other similar ākhyānas which are found in the Śruti in a nucleus-form that the Purāṇa and Itihāsa, along with the Vedas, are said to be the breath of the Mahā-Bhūta. The Pahlāda-carita is found in a number of Purāṇas, such as Matsya, Kūrma, Vārāha, Vāmana, Viṣṇu, the two Bhāgavatas, Padma, Brahmāṇḍa, Nṛsiṃha and Saura. The writer here shows how these various Purāṇas give their own versions of the Pahlāda-carita, which has been briefly referred to in the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads. He has also given here a brief summary of the Pahlāda story contained in the Kūrma Purāṇa. (cf. also his previous article on the Pahlāda-carita published in the 'Purāṇa' Vol. III, No. 1.)]

प्रह्लादचरिते न केवलं पुराणेषु, किन्तु तैत्तिरीयब्राह्मणे प्रथमाष्टक-  
पञ्चमप्रपाठके दशमानुवाके सप्तमं दशकमपि प्रमाणम् । तद्यथा—प्रह्लादो ह  
वै कायाधवः । विरोचनं स्वं पुत्रमुदौस्थत् । स प्रदरोऽभवत् । तस्मात्  
प्रदरादुदकं नाचमेत् इति । अलत्यसायणभाष्यं यथा—“कयाधूसंज्ञायाः  
स्त्रियाः पुत्रः प्रह्लादः स्वकीयपुत्रं विरोचनं केनापि निमित्तेन कुपितो हस्तेनोद्धृत्य  
क्वचिद्भूमावपातयत् । स भूमिप्रदेशः प्रदरः छिद्रोऽभवत् । तस्मात्  
प्रदरस्यासुरत्वात् तत्र प्रविष्टमुदकं नाचमेत् । तथा चापस्तम्बः—‘न  
वर्षधारास्वाचमेत् । तथा प्रदरोदके इति ।”

इदं दशकं सामान्यतः प्रह्लादचरितं प्रास्तौत् । प्रथमाष्टकपञ्चमप्रपाठकपञ्चमा-  
नुवाकप्रथमद्वितीयदशकेषु त्वितोऽपि विशदं प्रह्लादचरितमनुक्रमेते । तद्यथा—

“देवासुराः संयत्ताः आसन् । स प्रजापतिरिन्द्रं ज्येष्ठं पुत्रमपन्वधत् । नेदेनमसुरा बलीयांसोऽहनन्निति । प्रह्लादो ह वै कयाधवः । विरोचनं स्वं पुत्रमपन्वधत् । नेदेनं देवा अहनन्निति । ते देवाः प्रजापतिमुपसमेत्योचुः । नाराजकस्य युद्धमस्ति । इन्द्रमन्विच्छामेति । तं यज्ञक्रतुभिरन्वैच्छत् । तं यज्ञक्रतुभिर्नान्विन्दत । तमिष्टिभिरन्वविन्दत । तदिष्टोनामिष्टित्वम् । ऐष्ट्यो ह वै नाम ता इष्ट्य इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण । परोक्षमिया इव हि देवाः इति । इदमत्र सायणभाष्यम्—“देवाश्चासुराश्च यदा युद्धार्थमुद्यताः तदानीं प्रजापतिः स्वकीयं ज्येष्ठं पुत्रमिन्द्रं युद्धभूमेरपनीय क्वचिद् गूढे स्थाने निहितवान् । तस्यायमाशयः—बलीयांसोऽसुरा एनं दुर्बलमिन्द्रं नेदहन् नैव धन्वति । तथा कयाधू-संज्ञिताया हिरण्यकशिपुभार्यायाः पुत्रः प्रह्लादः स्वकीयं पुत्रं विरोचनमसुरसैन्यस्वामिनं युद्धभूमेरपनीय क्वचिन्निहितवान् । तस्यायमभिप्रायः—एवं विरोचनं देवाः सर्वथा मा धन्वति । एवं राजद्वयरहितयोः सेनयोरवस्थितयोः सत्योः देवाः प्रजापतिसमीपमेत्योचुः । राजरहितस्य सैन्यस्य न क्वचिदपि युद्धमस्ति । युयुत्सवः सर्वेऽपि राजानमन्तरेण पलायिष्यन्ते । तस्मादिन्द्रं राजानं तत्र तत्रान्विच्छाम इत्युक्त्वा प्रजापतिनाऽनुज्ञाताः तमिन्द्रं लब्धुं ज्योतिष्टोमादिरूपान् क्रतून्नुष्ठितवन्तः । अङ्गभूतेष्टिरहितैस्तेमहाक्रतुभिरिन्द्रमलब्ध्वा तत्र कारणमङ्गैष्टिवैकल्यं विचिन्त्य ता इष्टीरनुष्ठाय ताभिरिन्द्रं लब्धवन्तः इत्यादि । अनेन श्रुतिवचनेन प्रतीयते यत् श्रौतमिदमाख्यानमनादि-परम्परागतं, ब्रह्ममुखेन व्यासादिभिरवगतं चेति ।

अनेन चेदमवगम्यते—हिरण्यकशिपोः कयाधूसंज्ञायां भार्यायामुत्पन्नः पुत्रः प्रह्लादः । तेन स्वयं राज्यशासनाधिकारः परित्यक्तः, प्रह्लादस्य पुत्रो विरोचनस्तदा राजा आसीत् । इन्द्रविरोचनयोर्युद्धे इन्द्रस्य पराजय आसीत् तदा प्रह्लादेन स्वपुत्रो विरोचनो रक्षितः । ततः साङ्गक्रतूनामानुष्ठानेनेन्द्रस्येन्द्रपद-प्राप्तिः । विरोचनस्य क्वचित् रसातले पाताले वा सर्वदा वास आसीदित्यादि ।

तत्र कयाधूपुत्रः प्रह्लादः त्यक्तराज्याधिकारो विरोचनं स्वपुत्रं राज्ये स्थापयामासेत्यंशः कयाधूपुत्रत्वादिकथा च नृसिंहपुराणे एकचत्वारिंशाध्याये व्यक्तः—इति नृसिंहपुराणमस्मिन्नंशे वेदोपबृंहकम् ।

तत्र हिरण्यकशिपुपुत्रस्य राज्याधिकारोऽर्थसिद्ध आसीदित्यवगमात् हिरण्य-  
कशिपोर्वधः, तदनन्तरमेव प्रह्लादराज्याधिकारश्च प्रतीयते । तेन च नृसिंह-  
पुराणोक्तो हिरण्यकशिपुवधान्तकथासंदर्भः, विष्णुपुराणोक्तकथासंदर्भश्च वेदमूलक  
इत्यर्थसिद्धम् ।

प्रह्लादराज्यशासनपरित्यागनिमित्तं तु नरनारायणयुद्धकाले नरनारायणयो-  
र्भगवदंशत्वं तत्राभिव्यक्तभगवदुपदेशतोऽवगम्य, तदाराधनं विना न विजय इति  
विज्ञानम् । तत एव हिरण्याक्षपुत्रं तत्राभिपिच्य राज्यशासनाद् विरतिः,  
तन्मरणानन्तरं तु विरोचनस्य तत्राभिषेक इत्यर्थसिद्धम्, यदिदं कूर्मवामनादि-  
पुराणतोऽवगम्यते । “तस्य महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसितमेतदहमेवो यजुर्वेदः  
सामवेदोऽथर्वाङ्गिरसः पुराणमितिहासः” इति श्रुतौ पुराणस्यापि वेदस्यैव भगवतो  
निःश्वसितत्वेनाम्नानं प्रह्लादादिचरितानि श्रुत्युल्लिखितान्यभिप्रेत्यैव । इदमनेन  
ज्ञायते प्रह्लादचरितं प्रतिकल्पं प्रतिमन्वन्तरं वा वेदवदनुवर्तते । तत्र तत्र  
पुराणेषु तस्य तस्याख्यानस्य विस्तरेण स्वकीयया भाषया करणमात्रेण पौरुषेयत्वं  
व्यासकृतत्वं च प्रह्लादादिश्रौतचरितांशमात्रे अन्यत्र त्वाख्यानांशेऽपि श्रुत्यर्थो-  
पपद्यमानार्थं व्यासकृतत्वेन सर्वात्मना पौरुषेयत्वम्, न प्रह्लादादिचरित इव  
चरितांशेऽपि पौरुषेयत्वम् ।

अतएव मन्वन्तरभेदेन दत्तात्रेयपरशुरामाद्यवतारविशेषाणां केषाञ्चन परि-  
वर्तनवत् न परिवर्तनं प्रह्लादचरितस्य । सर्वथा तु मत्स्य-कूर्म-वराह-नृसिंहवामन-  
दाशरथिराम-बलराम-कृष्णावतारेषु नियमः, परशुरामबुद्धाद्यवतारेषु मन्वन्तरादि-  
भेदेनानियमः । व्यक्तं चैतत् कूर्मपुराणे मन्वन्तरभेदेनावताराणां केषाञ्चनानियम  
इति । कौशीतकीब्राह्मणोपनिषदीन्द्रप्रतर्दनाख्यायिकायाम् “अरुन्मुखान् यतोन्  
शालावृकेभ्यः प्रायच्छम्, प्रह्लादादीनृणम्” इतीन्द्रस्य प्रह्लादादिहिंसनाम्नानं तु  
प्रह्लादस्य गर्भावस्थायां तद्वधार्थमिन्द्रस्य प्रयत्नम्, मात्स्यदेवीभागवतादिसिद्ध-  
बलिशासनकाले प्रह्लादस्य देवैर्युद्धम्, महाभारताम्नानं विप्रवेष्टेणेन्द्रशुश्रूषणया  
सन्तुष्टेन प्रह्लादेन स्वमाहात्म्यातिशयनिदानवृत्तधर्मराज्यलक्ष्म्यादिमूलस्य स्वशील-  
स्येन्द्रेण वररूपेण प्रार्थितस्य वितरणादिकं बहुतरं प्रह्लादचरितांशं च  
श्रुत्यालङ्घनवगमयति ।



अतः सर्वथा प्रह्लादचरितमिदं श्रुतमिति तदुपपत्त्यर्थमेव कूर्मवाराह-  
भागवतद्वयविष्णुपुराणवामनपुराणसौरनृसिंहादिपुराणानां प्रवृत्तिः । तत्र वामन-  
पुराणं विरोचनशासनमधिकृत्य यद्यपि न बहु कथयति । तथापि तस्यापि  
राज्यशासनकाले देवानां पराजय आसीदित्याद्यवगम्यते । तत्र पूर्वोद्धृतेन  
ब्राह्मणभागेन प्रह्लादस्य विरोचनस्योपरि कोपः, तेन तस्य भूमौ पातनं  
चावगम्यते इति तदीयराज्यशासनपद्धतिर्धर्मविरुद्धाऽऽसीदिति सूच्यते । तत्र  
कारणं तु छान्दोग्ये इन्द्रविरोचनोपाख्यानतो विशदमवगम्यते । यत्र विरोचनेन  
नास्तिक्यवादोऽसुरेषु प्रचारित इत्याम्नायते । प्रह्लादो हि स्वपौत्रस्य बलेरपि  
कदाचन भगवन्निन्दया कुपितो राज्यभ्रंशादिकं भवत्वित्यशपदिति वामनपुराणं  
श्रावयति । सर्वथा तु बलिराज्यशासनपर्यन्तं निरीक्षकपदेऽवस्थाय तेन राज्य-  
शासनभारः परं संगृहीत इति वामनपुराणादितोऽवगम्यते ।

तत्र विरोचनस्य देवैः साकं युद्धे यद्यपि पराजय एवासीत्, परन्तु  
पुराणे कुत्रापि तच्चरितं न विस्तृतं दृश्यते । बलेस्तु देवासुरयुद्धावसरे प्राप्तविजयस्या-  
पि त्रिविक्रमावतारेण भगवदाज्ञया रसातलनिवास एव नियमितः । तथा  
नियमितस्यापि पुनरपि प्रसक्ते देवासुरयुद्धे कूर्ममात्स्यदेवीभागवतोक्तरीत्याऽत्यन्तं  
पराजय एवासीत् तदा तस्य देवप्रार्थितजगदम्बाद्वारा हनने प्रसक्तेऽपि प्रह्लाद-  
प्रार्थनया कथंचन जीवत एव मुक्तस्य रसातले वासो नियमितः, तथापि तस्य  
वैवस्वतमन्वन्तरसमाप्त्यनन्तरं सावर्णिमन्वन्तरे इन्द्रपदप्राप्तिः ।

सत्यमेवं प्रह्लादस्य धर्मिष्ठस्य सुशीलस्य सकाशात् युद्धसंभावनया भीत-  
भीतस्येन्द्रस्य द्विज्वेपेण प्रह्लादशुश्रूषारतस्य ततः संतुष्टेन प्रह्लादेन  
वरे दत्ते देवेन्द्रः प्रह्लादस्य “बलं बलवतां चाहं कामरागविवर्जितम्”  
इति गीतोक्तरीत्या कामरागादिविवर्जितं विशिष्टशीलोपपन्नं च बलमप्रतिद्वन्द्वि  
प्रह्लादसकाशात् वव्रे । तेन च तस्य शीलं वृत्तं धर्मः राज्यलक्ष्मीरित्यादि  
सर्वं तच्छरीरात् तेजोरूपेणापससार ततो निर्बलः प्रह्लादो वैवस्वतमन्वन्तरान्ते  
भगवत्सायुज्यमवापेति शान्तिपर्वादितोऽवगम्यते ।

प्रह्लादचरितांशस्तु कूर्मपुराणानुसार्येव साधुरवगन्तव्यः । तथाहि—दितेः  
कश्यपस्य द्वौ पुत्रौ—हिरण्यकशिपुः, हिरण्याक्षश्च । तत्र ज्येष्ठो हिरण्यकशिपुः

ब्राह्मणः प्राप्तनराद्यवध्यत्ववरः सर्वान्देवान्महर्षींश्च बबाधे । ततो भगवन्तं क्षीरोद-  
शायिनं शरणं गता देवास्तद्वधार्थं प्रार्थयामासुः । तदनुसारं भयानकं कञ्चन  
पुरुषमुत्पाद्य तद्वधार्थं भगवता स हिरण्यकशिपुसविधं प्रेषितो हिरण्यकशिपुपुत्रैः  
प्रह्लादादिभिरन्यैः, हिरण्यकशिपुना च युयुधे । अन्ततस्तु पराजितः स  
भगवत्सविधं गत्वा तद्विदितवृत्तं श्रावयामास । ततः सञ्चिन्त्य भगवता नृसिंहरूपं  
धृत्वा स्वयं तेन सह युद्धार्थं गतम् । तत्र हिरण्यकशिपुः कुपितः सानुब्रं  
प्रह्लादं तेन सह युद्धार्थं प्रेरयामास । ततः प्रवृत्ते युद्धे नृसिंहेन सानुब्रः प्रह्लादो  
निर्जितः । नृसिंहं सनातनं सर्वात्मकं च वासुदेवं विज्ञाय प्रह्लादः स्वयं  
युद्धादुपरम्यान्यानपि युद्धाद्विरन्तुमाज्ञापयत् । प्रार्थयच्च हिरण्यकशिपुमपि ततो  
विरन्तुम्, तमेव शरणमधिगन्तुं च परमात्मनस्तस्य गुणगणवर्णनपूर्वकम् । हिरण्य-  
कशिपुस्तु विष्णुमायया मोहितः स्वगृहभागतं कालचोदितमवध्यमपि नृसिंहं  
स्ववध्यं मत्वा तद्वधार्थमाज्ञापयामास । प्रह्लादस्तु तत्पुत्रो विहस्य—‘हे तात,  
भूतानामेकनायकम्, तथा तन्निधन्तारमेनं मा त्वमवजानीहि । कथं हि महादेवः  
कालवर्जितः स्वतः शाश्वतो वा कालात्मा कालेन हन्तुं शक्यते कालरूपधृक् च  
विष्णुः,—

मा निन्दस्वैनमीशानं भूतानामेकमव्ययम् ।

कथं देवो महादेवः शाश्वतः कालवर्जितः ॥

कालेन हन्यते विष्णुः कालात्मा कालरूपधृक् ॥

इत्यादिनोद्धोध्य तं युद्धान्निवारयामास । निवारितोऽपि यदा युद्धार्थमेव हिरण्य-  
कशिपुः प्रास्तौपीत्, तदा नृसिंहेन नखैर्विदारितः कालवशं गतो मृतश्च । ततो  
हिरण्याक्षेण युद्ध उपक्रान्ते सोऽपि वराहरूपधारिणा विष्णुना हतः, प्रह्लादस्तु  
राज्येऽमिपिक्तो विष्णुतत्परो विहायासुरं भावं निःसपत्नं राज्यं स्वधर्मनिरतो  
विधिवद् भागवतानाराधयश्च शशास ।

एवं राज्यं परिपालयन्नपि प्रह्लादो देवमायया मोहितः कदाचिदासुरभावेन  
स्वाभाविकेनाक्रान्तः स्वगृहागतं कञ्चन ब्राह्मणमहंकारेण न समभाषत ।

तेन कुपितः स ब्राह्मणः क्रोधसंस्तलोचनो दैत्येन्द्रमेवं शशाप—यत्तद्वबल-  
मवष्टभ्य त्वं ब्राह्मणानवजानीसि, सा तव वैष्णवी शक्तिः क्षयमेष्यति—इति तत्र

तमेवमुक्त्वा तूर्णं निर्ययौ । ततस्तु विमोहितः स देवैः, विष्णुना च साकं युद्धार्थं प्रस्तुतः, विष्णुना निर्जितश्च । पूर्वसंस्कारमाहात्म्यात्परस्मिन् भगवति नारायणे यथापूर्वं भक्तिमधिगत्य योगासक्तमानसः स्वपितृव्यपुत्रमन्धकासुरं राज्येऽभिषिच्य राज्यशासनतो विरराम ।

एतदनुरोधेन प्रह्लादचरितनिष्कर्षे तु प्रह्लादस्य हिरण्यकशिपुवधात्पूर्वं द्विवारं युद्धमभूत् । तत्र प्रथमे भगवत्स्वरूपं तेन नावबुद्धम् । तत्र तस्य विजय एव । द्वितीये तु तदवबुध्य युद्धादुपरम्य तेनान्येऽपि वारिताः, यदेव सौरपुराणे संकलितम् । नृसिंहावतारः, स्तम्भादाविर्भावो वा भागवतादिषूपक्षिस्तस्तु प्रह्लादेन हिरण्यकशिपो-  
वर्णानन्तरं क्रुद्धस्य युद्धकमघट्टं मध्ये संयोज्य समर्थनीयः । तेन च न कस्यापि पुराणस्य विरोधः ।

राज्यशासनकाले देवैर्विष्णुना च प्रह्लादस्य युद्धप्रस्तावः, तत्र प्रह्लादस्य पराजयः, ततो राज्यशासनतोऽपि विरम्य योगमार्गं एव तस्यावस्थानमासीदिति योगवासिष्ठतोऽवगम्यते । योगनिष्ठस्यापि तस्य नरनारायणयोरिव दुर्निधम्या-  
हंकारवशाद् नरनारायणाभ्यां सह तस्य युद्धमासीत्तदीयशासनकाल इति त्वन्यदेतत् । एतावत्स्वत्रावश्यमवसेयम्—यत्, प्रह्लादस्याहंकारो ब्राह्मणशापप्रयोजकः न केवलं नरनारायणयुद्धकाले देवीभागवतरीत्या, किन्तु तदनन्तरमपि । तत एव ब्राह्मण-  
शापोऽपि । सति चैवं वामनपुराणे नरनारायणयुद्धं मध्ये संप्राप्य राज्यशासनेऽन्धकोऽभिषिक्त इति कथासन्दर्भोऽपि वामनपुराणीयतपश्चर्यातः पूर्वमेव योजनीयः । नरनारायणयुद्धेऽपि विजयाप्राप्तिः ब्राह्मणशापनिर्वन्धनैवेति योजनाऽपि न विरुध्यते ।

सति चैवं सौरपुराणरीत्या, ब्राह्मणेनातिथिना शप्तः प्रह्लादः कदाचन च्यवनोपदेशमनुसृत्य तीर्थयात्राप्रसङ्गेन नैमिषारण्यं प्रस्थितस्तत्र नरनारायणाभ्यां युयुधे । तत्रापासजयः स तदाराधनं विना विजयो न भवतीति भगवतोपदिष्टः स्वीयरज्यशासनाधिकारमन्धकासुरे स्वीये पितृव्यपुत्रेऽवस्थाप्य तपोऽर्थमगमत् । ततो नरनारायणौ विजित्य स्वराजधानीमागतोऽन्धकादिभिः प्रार्थितोऽपि राज्य-  
शासनाधिकारं न स्वीचकार, परन्तु निरीक्षकपदमात्रं सोऽङ्गीचकार । ततः कदाचनान्धकासुरस्य देवानां च युद्धे यमेन साकं प्रह्लादोऽपि युयुधे । ततो देवानां पराजयेऽन्धकानन्तरं प्रह्लादो विरोचनं स्वपुत्रमभिषिच्य, तस्याप्यनन्तरं

तत्पुत्रं बलिं तत्र राज्याधिकारे स्थापयामास । बलिना साकं देवानां युद्धेऽपि प्रथमे देवानां पराजये बल्यादोनां तेषामिन्द्रादिस्थानेऽभिषेकेन प्रह्लादस्तेषां द्वारा त्रैलोक्यशासनं कारयामास ।

ततो दुःखितानां देवानां प्रार्थनया भगवान् वामनरूपेण कश्यपस्यादित्या-  
मुपेन्द्ररूपेणाविरासीत् । तस्य गर्भवाससमये तत्र तत्र प्रवृत्तान्यवगुणानि  
शकुनानि दृष्ट्वा किमिदमिति बलिना परिपृष्टः प्रह्लादः भगवदवतारं भाविन-  
मुपदिश्य तत्र भक्त्यतिशयेन तव रक्षा भविष्यतीति बोधयामास । तदन्वहंकार-  
भरितो बलिर्मगवन्तं निनिन्द तेन च क्रुद्धः प्रह्लादः तस्य राज्यभ्रंशो भविष्य-  
तीति शापं प्रदाय पुनस्तेनानुनीतोऽपि भगवच्छरणागतिरेव तव शरणमिष्युक्त्वा  
तीर्थयात्रार्थं प्रस्थितः । तीर्थयात्राप्रसङ्गेन बहूनि तीर्थस्थानानि शैवानि, वैष्णवानि,  
अन्यानि च गत्वाऽन्ते कुरुक्षेत्रं गत्वा तत्रैव वासमकरोत् । एतावता कालेन  
वामनस्यावतीर्णस्य पंचषाणि वयांसि गतानि । कृतोपनयनश्च स गुरुकुलवासम-  
करोत् । अवसरे चास्मिन् शुक्राचार्यादीनां प्रोत्साहनेन कुरुक्षेत्रं समागत्य  
तत्रैवाश्वमेधयज्ञानुष्ठानसंक्रम्य बलेः प्रावर्तत । तमवसरमुपलक्ष्य वामनोऽपि  
स्याचार्यादिभिः सह तत्रागत्य बलिस्त्रिविधे पदत्रयं यथावे । प्राप्तवरश्च स पदद्वयेन  
त्रैलोक्यमाक्रम्य तृतीयपदार्थं बन्धो दीयतामिति निययुजे । तदा तत्पुत्रेण  
बाणासुरेण स्वीयमाधमर्ष्यं दुष्परिहरमेवेति वर्णिते पदद्वयपदानसुखैर्वलेः  
सावर्णिकमन्वन्तर इन्द्रपदप्राप्तिर्भविष्यति, सांप्रतं तु रसातले एव स्थातव्यमित्या-  
ज्ञप्तो बलिः सपरिवारो रसातलं प्राविशत् । प्रविष्टमात्रेण तेन स्मृतमात्रः  
प्रह्लादः कुरुक्षेत्रात् रसातलमाजगाम । आगतश्च तस्मै भागवतानन्यांश्च  
धर्मानुपदिदेश । सांप्रतमपि बलिः प्रह्लादशासनानुसारं तदुपदेशानुगुणं च  
रसातलं सपरिवारः शास्तीति प्रह्लादचरितसंदर्भसंग्रहः ।

तत्र नवतितमाध्यायमारभ्याष्टादशभिरध्यायैरेष्टादशपुराणप्रतिपाद्यप्रधानाख्यान-  
संग्रहावसरे प्रह्लादचरितमघोनिर्दिष्टेषु पुराणेषु वर्तत इति बृहन्नारदीयं  
संगृह्णाति । तत्र भागवतसप्तमस्कन्धतुरीयाध्यायादिः, विष्णुपुराणप्रथमांश-  
पञ्चदशाध्यायादिः, वामनपुराणगततदीयचरितांशश्च यथावदुपवर्णितः । तत्र  
ब्रह्माण्डपुराणेऽपि प्रह्लादोपाख्यानं संगृहीतम् । तत्र लिङ्गपुराणे तदुपाख्या-

नप्रस्तावः शरभावतारं भाविनं लक्ष्यीकृत्य इति तस्यैव तत्र प्राधान्यम् । तत्र हि कुपितस्य नरसिंहस्य निग्रहणार्थं शंभोर्देवप्रार्थनया शरभावतारो वर्णितो विस्तरेण । ब्रह्माण्डपुराणं तु श्रीविष्णुपुराणवदेव संग्रहेण प्रह्लादचरितमनुक्रमते ।

तत्र प्रह्लादवंशानुक्रमिकाविषये ब्रह्माण्डपुराणं विष्णुपुराणेन समानम् यत्रान्धकासुरः सिंहिकाया हिरण्यकशिपुसोदर्याः पुत्र इति वर्ण्यते । वामनपुराणम्, कूर्मपुराणं चान्धकं हिरण्याक्षपुत्रमाचष्टे इति प्रतीयमानो विरोधस्तु सिंहिकापुत्रोऽप्यन्धकः स्वस्त्रीयः स्वपुत्रवदेव हिरण्याक्षेणाभिमानेन रक्षित इति विधया भवितुमर्हति ।

## पुराणरत्नानि

प्रह्लादो बालवानवान् प्रति—

बाल्ये क्रीडनकासक्ता यौवने विषयोन्मुखाः ।

अज्ञा नयन्त्यशक्त्या च बार्द्धकं समुपस्थितम् ॥

तस्माद्बाल्ये विवेकात्मा यतेत श्रेयसे सदा ।

बालयौवनवृद्धाद्यैर्देहभावैरसंयुतः ॥

( विष्णुपु०, १।१७।७५-७६ )

## Late Prof. BETTY HEIMANN

The passing away of our learned contributor BETTY HEIMANN, Professor of Sanskrit and Indian Philosophy in London, has removed an eminent Indologist from the realm of Oriental scholarship. She 'has passed away very peacefully on Friday, 19th May, '61 at Sirmione, Lake Garda'

Prof. B. HEIMANN was a great lover of India's Philosophy and ancient culture. In her letter dated 31st October, 1960 she wrote : "The word 'Purāṇa' has for me a magic significance and is worthy of reverence. 'The Older the Better' is my motto for my Indian studies !"

The subject of her present article—THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE "IT"—was 'central in her mind always.' In her letter of March 27, '61 she remarked about her PHILOSOPHY OF THE "IT", as follows :—

"It is indeed an expression of my deep conviction and appreciation of my Purāṇa India of venerated past. The more I study it, the more I believe in India's "IT"—in contrast to Western Post-Aristotelian 'Person'—as highest value."

May her soul rest in eternal Peace !

‘स्वस्ति वः पाराय तमसः परस्तात्’

Hail ! May you attain the eternal abode of the Supreme Brahman, beyond all darkness.

# THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE "IT"

BY

B. HEIMANN

[ अस्मिन् निबन्धे ब्राह्मणदेशीयया 'बेटि हाइमान्' नाम्न्या विदुष्या 'तद्' इत्याख्यस्य तत्त्वस्य तदभिव्यक्तीनां ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवादीनां देवतानां च विषये तथा निर्वाणस्य च विषये सारगर्भिता विचाराः प्रस्तुताः । 'तद्'-विषयको विचारो भारतवर्षेऽतिप्राचीनकालादेव सर्वोपरि वर्तते । 'तत्' शब्दोऽयं निर्विशेषं परं ब्रह्म लक्षयति । 'तद्' अनिर्वचनीयं निर्गुणं सर्वान्तरं सर्वान् कूटस्थममृतं च तत्त्वम् । तत् 'सद्' इत्येव वक्तुं शक्यते । अखिलप्रपञ्चस्य तत्रैवान्तर्भावः । तदेव परममक्षरम्, तस्मादेव परमाक्षराद् विश्वं विसृज्यते, तत्रैव च प्रलीयते । 'तद्' एव परा शक्तिः परा प्रकृतिश्च । अस्या एव प्रकृतेर्घोरं संहारकं च रूपं 'रुद्र' इत्याख्यातम् । 'रुद्रः' एव पश्चाद् 'महादेवः' 'शिवः' इति च मन्यते स्म । सर्वा देवता ब्रह्मण एवाभिव्यक्तयः, तस्यैवांशा वा ( यथोक्तं भागवते—“यस्य ब्रह्मादयो देवा वेदा लोकाश्चराचराः । नामरूपविभेदेन फलव्या च कलया कृताः ॥” ८।३।२२ ) । पृथिव्यामन्तरिक्षे दिवि वा यावन्तो भावाः, चेतना जडा वा, सूक्ष्माः स्थूला वा, सदसद्रूपा मनोवृत्तयश्च—तत्सर्वं ब्रह्मण एव रूपत्वाद् देवतापदवाच्यम् ( यथा विष्णुपुराणे—“यत्किञ्चिन्मनसा ग्राह्यं यद् ग्राह्यं चक्षुरादिभिः । बुद्ध्या च यत्परिच्छेद्यं तद्रूपमखिलं तव ॥” १।४।१६ ) ।

ऋग्वेदे बहुदेवतावादः सत्रैश्वरवादश्चोपलभ्यते । परं तावुभावपि 'एकं सद् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति' इति वैदिकसिद्धान्तेऽन्तर्भवतः । विदेशीयानाम् एकेश्वरवादस्तु न भारतीयानामभिमतः । भारते हि न कस्यचिदप्येकस्य देवस्य एकान्ततः प्रधानत्वं मन्यते । विष्णुशिवादयो देवा देशकालादिभेदेन दृष्टिभेदेन च सर्वोपरित्वं प्रधानत्वं च लभन्ते, न तु परमार्थतः । परमार्थतस्तु ते सर्वे ब्रह्मणोऽंशा एव । विष्णवादयो देवा एव किञ्चित्प्रयोजनमुद्दिश्य काले कालेऽवतारं गृह्णन्ति, ब्रह्म तु स्वात्मना कदाचिदपि नावतरति । इयं सृष्टिश्च ब्रह्मणो निष्प्रयोजनं लीलामात्रमेव ( ब्रह्मसूत्रं, २।१।३१, ३२; भागवतम्, १।३।३६ पृ० ) । ब्रह्मैव सृष्टिस्थित्यन्तकरणीं ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवात्मिकां संज्ञां याति ( विष्णुपु०, १।२।६१-६३, ६६ ) । परन्तु देवतान्त्रिकस्यैवं भावना पश्चात्कालीना ।

बौद्धग्रन्थेषु 'निर्वाण', 'कृत्स्न' 'शुक्ल', 'शून्य' इत्यादिशब्दैरभिहितस्य तत्त्वस्य 'ब्रह्म'तत्त्वेन सह साम्यं वर्तते । यत्र सर्वेषां विशेषाणां सर्वासां च

व्यक्तीनां निरोधस्तदेव निर्विशेषमव्यक्तं च तत्त्वं 'शून्यं' 'निर्वाणं' वा ( "निर्वाणं न नाशो न मरणं । . . . निर्वाणमार्यज्ञानप्रत्यात्मगोचरं शाश्वतोच्छेदविकल्प-भावाभावविवर्जितम् ।" इति लंकावतारसूत्रं, पृ० ६६ ) । बौद्धग्रन्थेषु यत् तत्त्वं 'शून्यं', 'निर्वाणं' वा, तदेव ब्राह्मण-ग्रन्थेषु 'ब्रह्म' 'ब्रह्मनिर्वाणं' वा । तदेव पूर्णं तत्त्वम् । तदेव 'नेति नेति' प्रभृतिभिः शब्दैर्निदिश्यते । सर्वविशेषेभ्यश्चो-त्थाय तस्मिन् निर्विशेषे परिपूर्णं परमतत्त्वे लय एव परमपुरुषार्थोऽभिमतः । ]

Each fully developed civilisation naturally contains the same complex of problems. However, one cannot easily dismiss the differences of the various civilisations in pointing out that the very same problems can also be found in other civilisations. It is not the problem itself, but it is its position in the centre or only at the periphery, its validity only for one time or at all times, its traditional or imported development, which accounts for the difference of the philosophies and religions concerned.

In surveying the Indian way of thought, there is one problem nowhere else in the world so persistently and consistently pursued all through the ages : it is that of the significance of the "It".

True, in the R̥gvedic literature of about 1500 B. C., the manifoldness of personal forms first meets the eye. Polytheism or even Pantheism is revealed in the personification and deification of natural phenomena in heaven, mid-air and earth. Significantly, also, abstracts and objects of the so-called inanimate nature are included in this pantheon of manifold deities. Already here, however, a specific trend of Indian thought is evident. Not earthly persons alone—man, animal and plant—are exalted to divine rank, thus widening the range beyond the recognised order of personalities endowed with Reason—not only personalities in heaven are assumed as intelligently functioning, or at any rate, purposeful divine beings, but also in mid-air the natural phenomena (rainstorms, winds, etc.) are invested with conscious and effective faculties.

In addition, gods and goddesses of virtue and vice are included in this complex Indian pantheon. The wide range of



innumerable personalities accounts for the merely relative value of each of these single gods. Moreover, these deities are more than only the sublimation of special human qualities. Everything in nature and in thought lends itself equally to be raised to the rank of a deity. Positive and negative qualities, both still participate in the essence of the Highest, fractions of which are dispersed in visible or imaginable cosmic forms. Innate intelligence or consciousness of function is not in itself a *conditio sine qua non* for deification. Vitality and intensity, carried by an intelligent, or a non-intelligent, representative count in themselves as divine factors. Nor is our human arbitration of "good" and "bad" the canon for their supreme values. Everything is divine which is *ugra* (root *vaj*, to be strong), powerful and awe-inspiring. Actually it seems that the destructive forces of nature overpower in might the benign deities who favour human life. *Rudra*, the howling tempest, in its destructive function, becomes in later Hinduism *Mahādeva*, the "Great God", under the euphemistic name *Śiva*, the Blessed. Ancient Hindu belief in gods is actually less man-centred i. e. not exclusively concerned with the human fate, than are the gods of other religions.

Moreover, even in another aspect early Hindu religion does not yield to human *hybris* (human conceit and self-sufficiency). Early Indian religion does not create its highest god as the ideal of a "super-man" whose main concern is human happiness, human ethics and human aspirations. Man is part and parcel of the whole, and cannot exclusively be taken as the model—though a less perfect one—of his god. Other worldly phenomena, animal and plant, serve in the same way to produce divine prototypes. Again, as mentioned before, it is not one single god nor one single form which is ever considered to be unique. There is no trend of thought which ever leads from Hindu Pantheism or Pan-en-theism or Theopanism to Monotheism (recognised as the ideal concept of Western religions). Kathenotheism, as Max Müller termed it, is the nearest to but fundamentally different from, Western Monotheism. One god of

human or animal origin or of a merely impersonal abstraction may temporarily, for a certain occasion or a certain sect, attain the supreme rank—but never to the exclusion of all other gods established or imaginable. It is Nature itself with its dynamic functions, irrespective of Reason and irrespective of personal consciousness, irrespective of ethics or non-ethics, and indifferent to solely human concern and purpose, which is accepted as the highest power. Man, just as his less intelligent fellow-creatures, has submissively to surrender to Nature. Furthermore, can Nature ever be grasped under the symbol of one single person and name alone? Nature emits personal forms, low and high, out of its quasi-neutral fulness, and re-absorbs them in the end into its indiscriminate fulness, *pūrṇatva*. Nature acts with pitiless dynamics. Nature is even more impressive in its destructive and awe-inspiring aspects than in its beneficial and gentle powers. If Nature is accepted as the highest Divine, the god *Śiva*, originally the representative of destruction, then truly is called the *Mahā-deva*, the Great God, the *Mahā Īśvara*, the Great Lord. The highest personal deity is a detached dispenser of natural functions without personal concern. The supra-personal, the supra-godly, the all-embracing neutral power of Nature is ultimately symbolized in the "It". Nature is the true "It", the not-bound to one single form of male or female, the *Ne-uter*, the not One or the Other, but the All combined, the all emanating, the all-absorbing Force.

The cult of Nature, it is true, has been practised all over the world as an early form of religion but what distinguishes Indian nature-religion from other similar forms of cult is that in India, early Nature-worship is never abandoned, not given up when the later religion rises to lofty heights. In India the veneration of Nature has never been discarded as outdated and primitive. On the contrary, primitivity is here appreciated in its productive ambiguity and unexhaustible potentialities. Nature-cult is the fundament of the earliest forms of Indian religions and remains the basis even of the highest and the most exalted speculations of Indian philosophy. Already

in the late books of the *Rgveda*, Nature is sublimated and evaporated, as it were, beyond the grasp of its visible appearances; beyond Nature's manifest forms it is furthermore valued as a principle of universal dynamics, thus being within, and outside, all phenomena at the same time.

In the mainly tropical climate of India, with its never-resting, ever-changing dynamic phenomena, doubly impressive in their sudden transformations from one state to the other, with the abrupt growth and decay, with the sudden transition from darkness and light without lingering twilight, Nature holds its sway over the human mind and its imagination. It is not astonishing, then, that India formed a notion more ingenious and adequate to Nature's ambiguous aspects of visibility and invisibility, of growth and decay, than any other civilisation known.

It is the concept of *Brahman* (neuter !), a concept so all-embracing, so expressive of each single natural phenomenon, of the sum of them all and, in addition, of the hidden further potentialities which are never—in Time and Space—all fully revealed. All these visible and invisible aspects are elements of the one concept, *Brahman* (from root *bṛh*, to grow and cause to grow). The *Brahman* itself is *a-guṇavat*, ultimately qualityless. Only in its manifestations, qualities seem to appear. Its true essence is nothing but *Sat*, Being or Reality, vague and indiscriminate. Significantly, this very term *Sat* is also used in the meaning of "good". This "good" however is not bound to any ethical limitation and arbitration. It is pure existence in itself, which is valued as positive—not subject to any human standards of ethical merits and demerits. Nature—*Brahman*—represents as the highest value, the life-force itself, the dynamics of which may be expressed in generation or destruction.

*Brahman* has a double, or rather triple, aspect. Its greater part, the three-quarters of "It", is for ever unmanifestable, (*Rgveda* 10, 90, 3ff). Only "It's" minor part lends itself to

manifestations in heaven or earth, in the past, present, or future, to the process of generation and destruction. "It's" major part is for ever beyond our reach; "It's" minor manifest parts follow its course of destruction and generation unconcerned with the fate of single individuals or genus, say Man.

Far-reaching religious conclusions result from this basic concept. How then can Man (or animal) venture to influence the *Brahman* principle by prayer and appeasement? The pure ideal of the *Brahman*-cult excludes the possibility of personal devotion and direct approach in prayer. *Brahman* lends itself only to unegoistic, wantless submission in meditation. The worshipper with his personal wants, personal prayers and offerings, can only approach *Brahman's* minor manifestations—deities, personal forms nearer to human beings, though graded as higher than their devotee. Deities are sublimated images of human concepts. This explains the apparent human *hybris* (self-righteousness) even towards the gods. The human agent, the worshipper, forces his god to react, to respond to his prayers. *Hybris* can be exercised towards man-conceived deities—but never towards the *Brahman*-principle.

There is yet another aspect of this mutual relationship between gods and men. The single gods, though in an elevated form, are also, in a way, subject to the law of re-incarnation. Also later Hinduism speaks of occasional descents (*avatāras*) of, for instance, the god *Viṣṇu*, who can be re-born in the form of a man, animal, or a bird, in order to fulfil momentary cosmic needs. It is true that these divine re-incarnations are not strictly obligatory for the god, but more beneficial for the other cosmic beings. *Brahman* itself, unapproachable as it is, can never be expected to re-appear for a certain single purpose in a certain single form. *Brahman* creates the world or worlds as its *Līlā*, purposeless play or display of its creative powers, in a child-like manner. The "It", the *Brahman*, constructs and destroys in a purposeless activity.

World-creation is significantly termed *visarga*, emanation, outflow and secretion (this very same term *visarga* is used for

any ordinary biological process—outflow and urge for secretion—in all physical bodies). Is this purposeless and may be insentient, quasi-biological process of emission, assumed for the *Brahman* principle, a degradation and profanation of the Highest? This is not a problem for the Indian thinker. Not for him who denies the divinity of functions limited by purpose and consciousness. Nature proves its superior power by its ever-productive urge and neutrality of vital dynamics.

In later Hinduism a trinity of deities is assumed, in which the god *Śiva* represents either generation and destruction combined (continuous dynamics in transformation and change), or he stands for the destructive power alone, or else, his third aspect is that of the Master-yogin, who with indifference and detachment, fulfils smilingly his opposite functions. His middle aspect is that of unperturbed balance. If the trinity is subdivided into three different gods, then the god *Viṣṇu* is responsible for the maintenance of the world (as the stabilising power within change). If *Śiva* is considered only as a destructive power, then another co-related symbol is introduced as a creating force. This, an off-shoot of the *Brahman* principle, is the god *Brahmā*. However, very few temples are dedicated to this god *Brahmā*, the creator—a fact astonishing for the Westerner, for whom Creation is the highest postulate of the divine functions. The god *Brahmā*, though related in name to the highest principle *Brahman*, is for the Indian of lesser importance than the god *Viṣṇu*, or even the god *Śiva*. Creation is but an accidental moment, continuously repeated and annihilated. Since R̥gvedic times, Creation alone never plays a predominant part in Hindu religion. The world, as any other individual, comes into being, develops, vanishes, and is re-born in yet another shape. Creation is not a unique act; never does Creation spring forth from a Nothing; nor is it endowed with a definite and final purpose. For the Indian, Creation is but a transitory emanation which inevitably is re-absorbed in the end. As such the god of Creation is here not worshipped as the highest power. The god *Brahmā* is only one passing phase of *Brahman's* ever-productive life-force.

All forms in heaven and on earth, in the past, present and future, are but negligible parts of the immeasurable and inexhaustible *Brahman*.

Buddhism, too, the daughter-religion of earlier Brahmanism, in spite of some of its reforms, is nourished by the fountain-head of former Brahmanic thought. In variant expression the basic concept of *Brahman* is retained. The idea of the productive "It" is upheld. True, Buddhism does not speculate on the primary "It", the source of all manifest forms, but it adheres to the conclusions drawn from it. Buddhism starts to investigate the natural phenomena as they are found in the world, and evaluates them as but changeable transitory forms, moments (*kṣaṇas*). However, for the end also Buddhism postulates an all-embracing neutral concept, the *Nirvāṇam*, the dissolution (lit. the blown-asunder) of single persons, of single names, of single definitions and arbitrations. The Buddhist speculations on the final *Nirvāṇam* are very much alike to the Brahmanic speculations on the final *Brahman*, which is significantly also called *Brahma-Nirvāṇam*. The Buddhist *Nirvāṇam* (very much akin to the Brahmanic concepts) is visualised as the No-thing-(not a Nothing, but not a single thing). It is noteworthy that *Nirvāṇam* is also termed the *Kṛtsnam*, the whole, or the *Suklam*, the indiscriminate Whiteness. Single colours then are no more distinguishable in their former specific hues. Emptiness of colour is produced by the accumulation of all colours. This simile serves to grasp the concept of the All and the None. The all-embracing Nenter covers all distinctions. The Buddhist uses for this postulated final state the pregnant term *Sūnyam*, the void. *Sūnyam* is most probably a derivation from the same root *Sun* (cf. K. F. Brugmann in his Comparative Grammar) from which also *Sūnam*, the excessive, the swollen, has its origin. How then can Void and Swollen be inherent in the very same root? Both are beyond the distinct single form and size, the one being a negative, the other a positive expression of the very same face of no-more or not-yet distinct shape, or no-more or not-yet name and dimension. *Kṛtsnam*, whole, and *Suklam*, white, and *Sūnyam*, void,

all of these terms are neuter in grammar; all of them alike indicate the lying-together or the falling-together of singleness within, or into, an indiscriminate whole. The Buddhist *Nirvāṇam* is yet another expression of the pre-Buddhist and post-Buddhist Hindu philosophy of the "It". No more single form of a person, or of a single thing, no more specific qualities of a special phenomenon, can be traced in this all-embracing reservoir of the "It"

True, Buddhism starts with a careful investigation of the single individuals and their continuous development in the course of their *Karma* sequence in re-incarnations. However, the final postulate lies in the annihilation of all individual personality, quality and tendency. The evaluation of all personal forms and of all historical moments of event is the same in Buddhism as it is in the *Brahman* speculations. Apparently Buddhism emphasizes more strongly the temporal middle stage of world-phenomena than the cosmic vision of Brahmanism, but in the result it comes to the same conclusion, that the only constant factor is the "It", the supra-personal and supra-changeable *Pūrṇatvam*, fulness of the All, which is no more a Something. Man, animal, plant and gods are finally re-absorbed into the all-embracing form-destroying "It". In spite of the impressive manifoldness of visible forms on earth and postulated forms in heaven—or just because of all this embarrassing multitude—the Indian Hindu and the Indian Buddhist are unimpressed, or even oppressed by, and try to detach themselves from, the abundance of appearances. The Indian longs for the state of absolute transcendence and unchanging constancy as the final aim. The Buddhist, too, strives after the amorphous "It".

Intensive observation and the ensuing depreciation of empirical phenomena finally leads the Indian beyond the empirical world of transitoriness. And yet, by this very negation of all practical and practicable phenomena as finalities, India has produced a scientific notion which, far beyond her own world of thought, has influenced the modern Western world, which is

based on entirely different presuppositions. The Indian postulate of transcendental *Sūnyam* has become the cardinal point of mathematical science.

The concept of *Sūnyam* is the concept of Zero. Actually the term for Zero in Sanskrit is *Sūnyam*, the same term as for the no-more differentiated All, the *Nirvāṇam*. Zero is the no-number or the matrix, and the falling-together of all numbers. Zero is the sum of all numbers, positive and negative combined. It is the productive point of indifference between the negative, the destroying, and the positive, the generating, elements. It is No-number by comprising all numbers. It is no more a number and yet the reservoir of them all. It is mathematically represented under the symbol of a circle, self-contained and enclosed in itself. It may accidentally embrace a smaller or greater spatial content, but essentially it remains the same. It is simultaneously the geometrical and algebraic basis for all calculations and dimensions. Zero is the mathematical expression, of the "It", beyond single name and form, beyond quantity and quality. It is not to be grasped and determined by any method of definition and measure. It is like *Brahman* and *Nirvāṇam*, an amorphous principle, active within and potential without, the empirical facts and factors.

Other consequences of the Indian concept of the "It" pertain to human ethics. Good and bad are bound to arbitration, limited by conscious selection. *Brahman*, the "It", combines them in the transcendental realm of no-more distinction. It is the life force which functions as *ugra*, awe-inspiring vitality. Destruction and generation are ambivalent expressions of this neutral energy. Only the human observer provides the positive or negative evaluation to it. The *Yoga*-system in its *Sūtras*, 3,22 and commentary, ventures to state that the highest is beyond human limitation of good and bad. "The *Karma* of the average man is either good (white) or bad (black), or a mixture of both. The perfected *Yogin*, however, is no more bound to any human discrimination between good and bad".



The highest state of mind leads to the annihilation even of ethical evaluation. Here, too, a kind of Zero, an ethical Zero, as it were, is assumed as the Highest.

A puzzling deduction of this doctrine can be found also in Indian drama—I think of an episode in the *Mṛcchakatikam*. There the burglar first hurries, and then stops before committing his offence. In order to observe his religious professional duties, in an initiation-ceremony for his burglary, he first meditates and carefully and devoutly recites verses from his *Caurya-śāstram*, lit. the "Sacred Text of Robbery". Only then he feels dutifully prepared for his theft. How can one explain this ethical neutrality towards, or rather, this subversion of, acknowledged standards of human society? One may even add here the "Holy Murder" of the Thugs. They felt religiously justified to commit even murder as a sacrifice to the destructive deity *Durgā*, the consort of the god *Śiva*. Does here appear—though perverted—an ideal which allows to destroy in order to approach and accelerate the state of annihilation? If thereby the amorphous "It" is pursued, then the extreme conclusions, when applied not to the transcendental but even to empirical conditions, truly are dangerous.

The cult of the *Ne-uter*, the 'Not-This', 'Nor-That' alone, has found its classical formulation as early as Upaniṣadic "*Na-iti, Na-iti*", the teaching of the absolute *Brahman*. The *Brahman* is "not this nor that", not any fixed notion of empirical knowledge and valuation. Not any of them, nor all of them combined, do justice to the all-embracing *Summum*. Is therefore the Latin term "*Ne-uter*" or the Upaniṣadic formulation "*Na-iti*" an essentially negative concept of the Highest? In other words: is a fundamental Pessimism and Nihilism underlying the Hindu and the Buddhist world of thought? It is not an absolute Negativism or Pessimism which reveals itself here. Though nothing of the limited sphere of empirical knowledge is considered as being sufficient, a positive postulate for the Beyond is maintained. The positive notion is reserved

and accepted for the transcendental world. The embarrassing multiformity, the transitoriness, the continuous change between enjoyment (*Priya*) and suffering (*A-priya*) do not answer the hankering after a complete and constant Bliss (*Ānanda*). Pessimism towards this changing world is born from an innate Optimism which postulates a perfect state of happiness beyond human conception. The "It", the *Brahman*, is for the Indian the claim for the certainty of undivided and undiminishing Bliss, *Ānanda*, in the Beyond. *Ānanda* is *Ananta*, the Unlimited. No person, human or divine, can fully do justice to the limitless, indefinite Infinite, to the Supra-Person.

### पुराणरत्नानि

यदा भावं न कुरुते सर्वभूतेषु पापकम् ।

कर्मणा मनसा वाचा ब्रह्म सम्पद्यते तदा ॥

यदा तेभ्यो न बिभेति यदा चास्मान्न बिभ्यति ।

यदा नेच्छति न द्वेष्टि ब्रह्म सम्पद्यते तदा ॥

( ब्रह्मपुराणम्, आनन्दा०, १२।४२-४३ )

## प्राचीनग्रन्थेषु पुराणानामुल्लेखः

[References to the Purāṇa or Purāṇas are also found in various ancient works other than the Purāṇas. Here some such references have been collected.]

१. स्वाध्यायं श्रावयेत् पित्र्ये धर्मशास्त्राणि चैव हि ।  
आख्यानानीतिहासांश्च पुराणानि खिलानि च ॥  
मनु० ३।२३२
२. स एष बहुश्रुतो भवति लोकवेदवेदाङ्गवित् ।  
वाकोवाक्येतिहासपुराणकुशलः  
( गौतमधर्मसूत्र ८।४-६ )
३. तस्य [=प्रजापालकनृपतेः ] च व्यवहारो वेदो धर्मशास्त्राणि  
अङ्गानि उपवेदाः पुराणम्  
( गौतमधर्मसूत्र ११।२१ )
४. पुराणपूर्णचन्द्रेण श्रुतिज्योत्स्ना प्रकाशिता ॥  
( महाभारत, आदिपर्व, १।८६ )
५. पुराणन्यायमीमांसाधर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।  
वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥  
( याज्ञ० स्मृति १।३ )
६. वाकोवाक्यं पुराणं च नाराशंसीश्च गाधिकाः ।  
इतिहासांस्तथा विद्यां योऽधीते शक्तितोऽन्वहम् ॥ ४५ ॥  
मांसक्षीरौदनमधुतर्पणं स दिवौकसाम् ।  
करोति तृप्तिं च तथा पितॄणां मधुसर्पिषा ॥ ४६ ॥  
( याज्ञ० स्मृति १।४५-४६ )
७. वेदाथर्वपुराणानि सेतिहासानि शक्तितः ।  
अपयज्ञप्रसिद्धयर्थं विद्यां चाध्यात्मिकीं जपेत् ॥  
( याज्ञ० स्मृति १।१०१ )

८. इतिहासपुराणमपि व्याख्यातेन मार्गेण संभवन् मन्त्रार्थवादमूलत्वात्  
प्रभवति देवताविग्रहादि साधयितुम्  
( शंकरकृत शारीरकभाष्य—१।३।३३ )
९. तस्मात् समूलमितिहासपुराणम्  
( तत्रैव १।३।३३ )
१०. प्रमाणेन खलु ब्राह्मणेन इतिहासपुराणस्य प्रामाण्यम् अभ्युपगम्यते ।  
ते वा खल्वेते अथर्वाङ्गिरसः० एतदितिहासपुराणस्य प्रामाण्य-  
मभ्यवदन्—इतिहासपुराणं पञ्चमं वेदानां वेद इति  
( न्यायभाष्य ४।१।६२ )
११. य एव मन्त्रब्राह्मणस्य द्रष्टारः प्रवक्तारश्च ते खलु इतिहासपुराणस्य  
धर्मशास्त्रस्य च  
( न्यायभाष्य ४।१।६२ )
१२. मीमांसते च यो वेदान् षड्भिरङ्गैः सविस्तरैः ।  
इतिहासपुराणानि स भवेद् वेदपारगः ॥  
( व्यासस्मृति ४।४५ )
१३. तदर्थं (=वेदार्थं) पालनायां च महर्षिपरम्पराभिः अङ्गोपाङ्गेतिहास-  
पुराणधर्मशास्त्राणि प्रणीतानि  
( न्यायवार्तिकतात्पर्यदोका २।१।६७ )
१४. पुरा विद्यमानत्वेऽपि संप्रति नवत्वात् पुराणत्वम्, चिरादनुसूतत्वेऽपि  
अपूर्ववन्नित्यानुभाव्यम् इत्यर्थः । अनादिवैदिकार्थविषयतया  
विद्यान्तरेभ्यः पुरातनत्वाद् वा पुराणत्वं, यथोक्तं वायव्ये—प्रथमं  
सर्वशास्त्राणां पुराणं ब्रह्मणोदितम् । अनन्तरं च वकोभ्यो वेदास्तस्य  
विनिःसृता । ( वेंकटनाथकृतस्तोत्ररत्नभाष्य )

# MATSYA PURĀṆA AND PROMISCUITY

By

S. G. KANTAWALA

[ पुराकाले मनुष्येषु मैथुनविषये कश्चिद् विवेको विवाहादिमर्यादा-  
भावश्चासीन्नवेत्यस्मिन्नबन्धे मत्स्यपुराणस्य शर्मिष्ठा-ययात्युपाख्यानं दीर्घतमसा  
शिक्षितस्य गोघर्मस्य वरानं चाश्रित्य विचार्यते । ऋग्वेदकालेऽपि मनुष्येषु  
विवाहप्रथा प्रचलित इति बहुभिर्चेदवचनैः सूच्यते । अतो मत्स्यपुराणादीनामे-  
तादृशान्युपाख्यानानि मनुष्येषु विवाहमन्तरेण निर्मर्यादमविविक्तं च मैथुनं  
ऋग्वेदकालात्पूर्वमेव प्रचलितमासीदित्येव सूचयेयुः । पुनश्च, शर्मिष्ठाया इत्यर्थं  
प्रार्थना तु तस्या आजीवनं कौमार्यं दासीभावं च प्राप्तत्वेन हेतुर्नैव, किं च  
“समावेतौ मतौ राजन् पतिः सख्याश्च यः पतिः” इत्यादि वचनं तस्या  
असुरधर्मनुसरणमेव सूचयति । दीर्घतमसा शिक्षितो गोघर्मोऽपि गोष्वेवार्यं  
प्रचलितो न तदानीन्तने मनुष्यसमाजे—इति दीर्घतमसो यवीयसो भ्रातुः पत्न्या  
कृतेन भर्त्सनेन दीर्घतमसो जलप्रवाहरूपदण्डेन च सूच्यते । एवं ममताबृहस्पत्योः,  
तारासोमयोः, इलाबुधयोः, उर्वशीपुरुवरसोश्च संगमोऽप्यत्र विचार्यते । ]

Marriage is one of the fundamental institutions of human society, and it is found in one form or another in every society, whether primitive or civilised. In this paper it is proposed to discuss the two episodes of sexual laxity, viz (1) the Śarmisthā Yayāti episode and (2) the episode of Dīrghatamas and the cult of *Godharma*, as found in the Matsya Purāṇa. Other instances of sexual aberrations are alluded to in fn. 31. Scholars like Bachofen, McLennan, Morgan and others expounded the view that “man lived originally in a state of promiscuity”,<sup>1</sup> but Westermarck combated this view and pointed out that, “it is not of course, impossible that among some peoples, intercourse between the sexes may have been almost promiscuous. But there is no shred of genuine evidence for the notion that promiscuity ever formed a general stage in the history of mankind”.<sup>2</sup>

In the opinion of MM. Dr. P. V. Kane, the Vedic works contain no indications about promiscuity.<sup>3</sup> The Mbh. tells us

the stories of the wanton women of Utlarakuru<sup>1</sup>, and of the city of Māliṣmatī<sup>2</sup>, notorious for their extraordinary sexual freedom, but this evidence is rebutted by scholars like Dis. Kane and Altekar on the ground of their being either mythical in nature or of the proverbial traveller's tale,<sup>3</sup> yet there are a few epical episodes, e.g. the Śarmiṣṭhā-Yayāti episode, which betray an astounding laxity in sexual morality, but most of these passages have a context and are not to be taken at their face-value as Dr. Altekar points out.<sup>4</sup> In the Matsyapurāṇa also, the Śarmiṣṭhā Yayāti episode occurs.<sup>5</sup> Śarmiṣṭhā who had escorted Devayānī to Yayāti's court as an attendant, was gifted with beauty, nobility and good character. After she had reached puberty, she happened, once, to meet Yayāti alone in the Aśoka grove and made advances to him, who mentioning her Śukra's prohibitive injunction, hesitated to fulfil her passionate longing, when she poignantly pointed out the non-difference between one's own husband and the friend's husband.<sup>6</sup> It is to be noted that the context clearly shows that many factors were responsible for such a bold statement and action. Her sex urges were repressed by her being driven into desperation by the unnatural punishment of eternal maidenhood inflicted upon her. It may be quite possible that Śarmiṣṭhā's ideology may reflect the complex of the Asura-culture, which having a different sex-morality, permitted such liaison,<sup>7</sup> or that probably this may be her psychological reaction resulting into a vehement expression of sexual urge emerging from a desire to wreak vengeance on Devayānī by causing Yayāti to be disloyal to her, and that her jealous anguish was aggravated by the fact that Devayānī who was her contemporary had a son by that time (31.8)—a natural cause for jealousy for women. Yayāti's defence on the ground of the sacred duty, chivalry and fear of being stigmatised as a foetus-killer,<sup>8</sup> when admonished by Śukra, appears to be astounding and unconvincing, as he appears to have been enamoured of her ravishing beauty.<sup>9</sup> In the opinion of Dr. Altekar, these traces of promiscuity are to be referred to the pre-Vedic times as we find the institution of marriage well established in the R̥gveda.<sup>10</sup>

Another glaring instance retaining the traces of grossest sex commerce is the one in which the doctrine of *Godharma* is inculcated by the Surabhīśuta to the sage Dīrghatamas. Once it so transpired that when the sage Dīrghatamas was residing in his younger brother Gautama's<sup>14</sup> hermitage, the son of Surabhī chanced to tread upon the sacrificial grass whereupon he caught the bull with its horn so tightly that it was a sheer impossibility for it to untie the firm grip. Being impressed by his amazing strength, it stooped to implore him for its freedom and to grant him a boon, and yet the sage of enviable strength was recalcitrant to free it when the latter observed, "Sire, to us, this is neither sin nor stealth; we discriminate neither between the edible and non-edible, nor between the drinkable and non-drinkable. We bother not about the propriety of a thing to be done or not; equally to us, there is no distinction in the matter of mating."<sup>15</sup> Bewildered as he was on hearing this quaint doctrine, he pleased the lord of the bull with food and drink and let it loose. Being tremendously impressed with the stimulating teachings of this *Godharma*, he approached his younger brother's wife to practise this new cult on her who expostulated him for his bull-like behaviour and set him adrift in the Ganges.<sup>16</sup>

From the above summary it is clear that the principal tenets, as inculcated in this episode, suggest unbridled sexual freedom. The fact that the sage Dīrghatamas borrowed the doctrine from the bull and that his action was met with opprobrium and persecution, suggests that it was alien and unpalatable to the society to which he belonged.

Dr. D. R. Patil seems to suggest speculatively that this custom of *Godharma* might be akin to the phallus-cult (*śiśnadeva*). The term '*śiśnadeva*' (RV. 7. 21. 5, 10. 99. 3) means "one addicted to sexual gratification, lustful, non celibate" according to Prof. Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya,<sup>17</sup> and "it could hardly mean those who worship phallus as god", as pointed out by MM. Dr. Kane.<sup>11</sup> Dr. A. D. Pusalkar also concurs with his view.<sup>19</sup> If the term '*śiśnadeva*' is taken in the sense "one

addicted to sexual gratification, lustful", and the cult of *Godharma* is linked up with it as suggested speculatively by Dr. Patil, it would suggest the gross sexual commerce in general, and in particular it would reflect upon the character of the celebrated sage Dīrghatamas. Moreover, the odium raised and the cruel punishment inflicted upon the purblind sage<sup>10</sup> would suggest, as noted above, the abhorrent character of this cult.

It may be reiterated that these passages are not to be interpreted superficially but contextually and these traces are to be referred to the pre-Vedic times as opined by the late Dr. A. S. Altekar.<sup>31</sup> With reference to the cult of *Godharma*, Dr. D. R. Patil observes that "it is difficult to suggest any historical explanation for this quaint practice of *Godharma*".<sup>32</sup> It may be suggested, as pointed out before, that this practice was alien to and unpalatable to the society to which the celebrated sage Dīrghatamas belonged. These passages need not be taken to reflect a general promiscuous state of the society; it shows that "mating must not be confounded with marriage. A realistic analysis of the institution of marriage does not confound the theory and actuality in sex-behaviour, nor does it derive conjugal life from sexual drive. To merge the two concepts is to forego an insight into the distinctively human element of the phenomenon".<sup>33</sup>

The Dīrghatamas-episode is also important from the point of view of the study of the relation between the elder brother and the wife of the younger brother. The lamentable fate of the sage Dīrghatamas at the hands of his younger brother's wife for approaching her, who was to him like a daughter-in-law<sup>34</sup>, to practise the teaching of *Godharma*, suggests that the senior brother's sexual intimacy with the younger brother's wife was odious, and it was met with serious consequences.<sup>35</sup>

Incidentally the Bṛhaspati-Mamata-episode may be alluded<sup>36</sup> to here, in contrast to the above behaved pattern. Once Uśija's<sup>37</sup> younger brother Bṛhaspati approached his elder brother's wife, Mamata, for sexual intercourse and she beseeched him to avoid her (i) as she was *enceinte*, (ii) he was



*amogharatas* and (iii) there was no space left for the second child. In spite of her persuasions, Bṛhaspati forced himself on her, and had his passion fulfilled. Bharadvāja, their issue, was accepted by Bharata as his son (49.31).

In this episode, Mamatā's words—"अस्मिन्नेवं गते काले यथा वा मन्यसे प्रभो"<sup>28</sup> suggest that there was nothing repulsive in the sexual intimacy of a younger brother with his elder brother's wife, even when the elder brother was alive. According to Dr. D. R. Patil, the important thing to note is the idea regarding sexual morality, and the story assumes more importance when Bharadvāja is adopted by Bharata.<sup>29</sup> This suggests also, as noted before, that 'mating need not be confounded with marriage'. It reminds one also of one of the conditions of the institution of *niyoga* viz, the appointment of a brother who is one of the persons competent for appointment<sup>30</sup>

There are other instances of sexual laxity found in the Matsya Purāṇa as well as in the Vāyu Purāṇa, which throw ample light on the sexual side of the society of those times.<sup>31</sup>

#### Abbreviations used in this paper :—

AIHT :	Ancient Indian Historical Tradition by Pargiter.
Mbh Cr. Ed :	Mahābhārata, Critical Edition, published by Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
MP :	Matsya Purāṇa, published by the Anāṇḍāśrama Press.
RV :	Rgveda.

Unspecified references e. g. 31.8 always refer to the MP, thus 31.8=MP 31.8.

- 
1. Westermarck, E. : *The History of Human Marriage*, p. 51.
  2. *ibid.*, p. 138.
  3. Kane P. V. : *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, p. 437 ; vide also Pandey R. B. : *Hindu Saṁskāras*, p. 269.
  4. Mbh. Cr. Ed., 1. 113. 4-7.
  5. Mbh. Cr. Ed., 2. 23. 23-24. Śvetaketu, the son of Uddalaka, is said to have abolished promiscuity (Mbh. Cr. Ed. 1. 118. 8-10).
  6. Kane, P. V. : *ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 428 ; Altekar, A. S. : *The Position of Women in the Hindu Civilisation*, pp. 34-35.
  7. Altekar, A. S. : *ibid.*, p. 35.

8. MP. Chapters 31 and 32.
9. "समावेतौ मतौ राजान् पतिः सख्याश्च यः पतिः ।  
समं विवाहं इत्याहुः सख्या मेऽसि पतिर्यतः ॥"  
MP. 31. 19, cf. MP. 32. 22 ; Mbh. Cr. Ed. 1. 77. 19.
10. cf. "तमेवासुरधर्मत्वमास्थिता....।" MP. 32. 19.
11. MP. 31. 32. 33. cf. Mbh. Cr. Ed. 1. 78. 32.
12. Yayati seems to reciprocate to her love being infatuated by her ravishing beauty of  
"वेदि त्वां शीलराम्पक्षां दैत्यकन्यामनिन्दिताम् ।  
रूपं तु ते न पश्यामि सूक्ष्ममपि निन्दितम् ॥"  
MP. 31. 14 ; cf. Mbh. Cr. Ed. 1. 77. 14, cf. Altekar A. S., *op. cit.* p. 36.
13. Altekar, A. S. . *op. cit.* p. 36.
14. It may be noted that Dirghatamas later on, came to be known as Gantama (MP. 48. 84) ; so we have now two Gautamas i. e. to say (1) Gautama who was formerly known as Dirghatamas, and (2) Gautama, the younger brother of Dirghatamas. In the opinion of Pargiter, the reading Gantama "seems to be a misreading as the sequel shows." Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 189, fn. 5.
15. MP. 48. 49 50.
16. MP. 48. 44 ff., vide Patil D. R., *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, pp. 45, 158-159, *Purāṇa Index* Vol. II, p. 97 ; Meyer J. G. *Sexual Life in Ancient India*, p. 124. According to Pargiter Dirghatamas "lived in his paternal cousin's hermitage whom the Purāṇas apparently call Śaradvant, but indulged in gross immorality or misbehaved towards the wife of younger Autathya (Aucathya)" *AIHT*, p. 189. He points out in fn. 5, on p. 158 that Śaradvant is Utathya's son according to the VP. 65, 101 and the Bṛh. 3, 1, 106.
17. Vedic Interpretation and Tradition, *Proceedings of the Sixth Oriental Conference*, pp. 500-502 ; The Phallus Worship in the Veda, *IHQ*, Vol. IX, p. 108.
18. Kane, P. V. : *ibid*, Vol. II, p. 708.
19. Pusalkar, A. D. *Śānadenā* in the Rgveda and Phallus Worship in the Indus Valley, *Sarvā Bhārati*, p. 51 ; for the views of other scholars vide *ibid*, pp. 49 ff.
20. Pargiter remarks that 'if a natural explanation may be suggested (about the sage's blindness), it is that he was not totally blind, but purblind or extremely short-sighted when young, and that his sight improved in the old age as it often happens in such cases', *Ancient Genealogies and Chronology*, *JRAS*, 1910, p. 44, fn. 4, vide also *AIHT*, p. 187, fn. 2.
21. Vide fn. 13.
22. Patil D. R., *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, p. 159.

23. Patil D. R., *op. cit.* p. 158; Lowie, *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, 10, 146.
24. Note the word *snusā* in MP 48, 54, *of*—  
 भ्रातुर्ज्येष्ठस्य भार्या या गुह्यपत्न्यनुजस्य सा ।  
 यवीयसस्तु या भार्या स्नुषा ज्येष्ठस्य सा स्मृता ॥ मनुस्मृति १. 57
25. This reminds one of the punishment laid down for approaching the wife of a brother —  
 माता पितृष्वसा श्वश्रूमातुलानी पितृव्यजा ।  
 पितृव्यसखिशिष्यस्त्री भगिनी तत्सखी तथा ॥  
 भ्रातृभार्यागमे पूर्वाद्दण्डस्तु द्विगुणो भवेत् ॥ MP., 227, 139
26. MP 48, 32 ff; 49, 17 ff, *cf.* Patil D R, *op. cit.*, p. 46; Dikshitar V.R.R. *Purāṇa Index*, Vol. II, p. 634; Mahābhārata Cr. Ed. I, 98, 6 ff.
27. V P. Utathya in. *ॐ* For the discussion of variants vide Pargiter F. E., *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 157 ff.
28. MP 48, 86. Mamata's remark, "the *Dharma* is violated" (49, 19) is an additional argument from the moral point of view. In an angry rebuff Bhaspati retorts to her that no rules of modesty are to be preached to him (49, 20).
29. Patil D. R., *op. cit.*, p. 159. Pargiter (*ibid.*, p. 180) points out that the MP. version is later than the VP. version.
30. Kane, P. V, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol II, p 601.
31. In the MP there is also the Soma-Tārā episode which occurs in the Vāyu Purāṇa also. Once Soma chanced to see Bhaspati's beautiful wife Tārā strolling in a garden Both of them were inflamed with passion and enjoyed for a long time. At last war broke out to regain her, when Soma refused to return her. Ultimately Brahma interceded and a compromise was effected. At this time Tārā was pregnant and the child born was named Budha whose biological father, as even admitted by Tārā, was Soma (M. P23, 29 ff; 24, 1 ff) Dr. Patil lists this episode of the Vāyu Purāṇa under "Seclusion of Women" (*ibid.*, p. 42) and under "Promiscuity" (*ibid.*, p 41) and remarks that 'in the first instance we find Tārā, the wife of Bhaspati, seduced by Soma. What is necessary to notice here is the procedure followed in deciding the vexed question of the paternity of the child born of that 'illicit union'. The procedure does not at all indicate that Soma's connection with Tārā was a case of 'illicit' union, offending sanctity of the marriage tie." (*ibid.*, p. 167). Here it may be better to take this episode as a case of abduction (cf. *parastrīharanāya* MP. 23, 46) and adultery (cf. 23 30-31). Moreover this abduction of Tārā by Soma and the tortures caused by Indra to Varāṅgī, the wife of Vajraṅga, (146, 63 ff; 147, 1, 13) may also suggest that ladies could move freely in the society, but at times it was not a safe movement',

In the MP. (II. 43 ff) as well as in the Vāyu Purāṇa there is the episode of Budha and Ilā. This is listed by Dr. Patil under "Promiscuity" and he remarks that the Vāyu text "expressly says that she was 'invited' by him for cohabitation" (*ibid.*, p. 157, cf. *maithunāya upanimanirūḍa*, Vāyu Purāṇa, 85. 17). In the MP. she is invited for enjoyment and gracing the home (cf. II. 69-83) she spent her time in the pleasure and dalliance with him for a long period.

The Urvaśī-Purūravas-episode in the MP. (24. 12 ff) is a case of love at first sight between a human king and a celestial bātara who was abducted by the demon Keśin and released by Purūravas. This episode occurring in the Vāyu Purāṇa is also listed by Dr. Patil (*ibid.*, pp. 44, 157) under 'Promiscuity.'

## रतिकृता शिवस्तुतिः

( मत्स्यपुराणम्, आनन्दाश्रम०, १५४।२६-२७० )

नमः शिवायस्तु निरामयाय नमो शिवायस्तु मनोमयाय ।  
 नमः शिवायस्तु सुरार्चिताय तुभ्यं सदा भक्तकृपापराय ॥२६०॥  
 नमो भवायस्तु भवोद्भवाय नमोऽस्तु ते ध्वस्तमनोभवाय ।  
 नमोऽस्तु ते गूढमहाव्रताय नमोऽस्तु मायागहनाश्रयाय ॥१॥  
 नमोऽस्तु शर्वाय नमः शिवाय नमोऽस्तु सिद्धाय पुरातनाय ।  
 नमोऽस्तु कालाय नमः कलाय<sup>१</sup> नमोऽस्तु ते ज्ञानवरप्रदाय ॥२॥  
 नमोऽस्तु ते कालकलतिगाय नमो निसर्गमलभूषणाय<sup>२</sup> ।  
 नमोऽस्त्वमेयान्धकर्मदकाय नमः शरण्याय नमोऽगुणाय ॥३॥  
 नमोऽस्तु ते भीमगणानुगाय नमोऽस्तु नानामुवनादिकर्त्रे ।  
 नमोऽस्तु नानावगतां विधात्रे नमोऽस्तु ते चित्रफलप्रयोक्त्रे ॥४॥  
 सर्वावसाने ह्यविनाशनेत्रे<sup>३</sup> नमोऽस्तु चित्राध्वरभागभोक्त्रे<sup>४</sup> ।  
 नमोऽस्तु भक्ताभिमतप्रदात्रे<sup>५</sup> नमः सदा ते भवसङ्गहर्त्रे ॥५॥  
 अनन्तरूपाय सदैव तुभ्यम् असह्यकोपाय नमोऽस्तु तुभ्यम् ।  
 शशाङ्कचिह्नाय सदैव तुभ्यम् अमेयमानाय नमः स्तुताय<sup>६</sup> ॥६॥

प्रमुखपाठान्तराणि (अत्र कोशानां संकेताः यथा 'पुराणम्' भाग १, अंक १, १०३-११० पृष्ठेषु मया प्रयुक्ताः) —

१. नमोऽकलाय (Ś1, D1) । २. ०लभूतिकाय (D7, D9-10) ; ०नर्त्तिक-भूतिकाय (L11-14) । ३. ०ने सविनाशनेत्रे (N1, D9-10, 12) ; सर्गावसाने च विनाशयोक्त्रे (Ś1, D1) । ४. ०त्राध्वरभाग० (Ś1, D1) । ५. अतः परमधिकः फलं 'नमोऽगुणकर्मप्रसवस्य वेत्रे' (Ś1, D1) । ६. अतः परमधिकः पाठः 'नमोऽगुणरूपाय नमोऽस्तु तुभ्यम्' (Ś1, D1) । ७. नमोऽस्तुताय (N1, D9-10) ।

वृषेन्द्रयानाय पुरान्तकाय नमः प्रसिद्धाय महौषधाय ।  
नमोऽस्तु भक्त्याऽभिमतप्रदाय नमोऽस्तु सर्वार्तिहराय तुभ्यम् ॥७॥<sup>१</sup>

चराचराचारविचारवर्यम् आचार्यमुत्प्रेक्षितभूतसर्गम् ।  
त्वामिन्दुमौलिं शरणं प्रपन्ना प्रियाप्रमेयं महतां महेशम् ॥८॥

प्रयच्छ मे कामयशःसमृद्धिं,<sup>१०</sup> पुनः प्रभो जीवतु कामदेवः ।<sup>११</sup>  
प्रियं विना त्वां प्रियजीवितेषु<sup>१२</sup> त्वत्तोऽपरः को भुवनेष्विहास्ति ॥९॥

प्रभुः प्रियायाः<sup>१३</sup> प्रसवः प्रियाणां प्रणीतपर्यायपरापरा<sup>१४</sup> ।  
त्वमेवमेको<sup>१५</sup> भुवनस्य नाथो दयालुरुन्मीलितभक्तभीतिः<sup>१६</sup> ॥१०॥

आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त

८. भक्तभिः (N1, D2, 9-10, 12) ; भीतेष्वभयप्रदाय (S1, D1) । ९. अतः परमशक्तिः पाठः 'सर्वार्तिहराय नमः शिवाय (S1) । १०. प्रयच्छ मे काममुदेतु कामः (S1, D1) । ११. कामं विना का त्वपरापि जीवेत् (S1, D1) ; वैधव्यदृष्टैर् भगवन्मस्ते (D3-6) । १२. प्रियं विना तं विरतं रतेषु (N1, S1, D1) ; प्रियं विना तं विनतं नरेषु (D3-8) । १३. 'प्रियायाः' इति पाठः आनन्दा० पुस्तके एव, अन्यत्र तु 'प्रभावी' इति पाठः । १४. ०परापराणाम् (D2, 13-14) । १५. त्वमेव चैको (N1, S1, D12-14) । १६. त्वमेव सर्वस्य हि भक्तिमितिः (D12-14).

## FURTHER GLEANINGS FROM THE MATSYA PURĀṆA\*

By

V. RAGHAVAN

[ मत्स्यपुराणे बहूनामवान्तरविषयाणां विद्यानां चोल्लेखः प्राप्यते ; यथा २४ अध्याये जिनधर्मस्य, ४७ अध्याये पञ्चानां वृष्णिवीराणां, तत्रैव च दशानामवताराणां निर्देशोऽपि वर्तते ; न्यायसांख्ययोगादिशास्त्राणां भागवत-सौरवैष्णवमाहेश्वरादिधर्माणां चोल्लेखोऽप्यत्र मत्स्यपुराणे विद्यते, दक्षिणापथस्य च पाण्ड्यादिजातीनां कृष्णाकावेर्यादिनदीनां च वर्णनमप्यस्मिन्पुराणे प्राप्यते— एतत्सर्वमस्मिन् निबन्धे स्पष्टीकृतम् । मत्स्यपुराणस्य केषांचिदंशानां साम्यं वाल्मीकि-रामायणेन, कुमारसंभवाख्येन कालिदासस्य काव्येन, जयदेवकृत-गीतगोविन्देन च सह प्रदर्श्य मत्स्यपुराणमेव तैः प्रभावितमित्यप्यत्र विदुषा लेखकेन प्रतिपादितम् । अस्मिन् प्रसङ्गे केचिदुपयोगिनः पाठभेदा अपि विचारिताः, तानाश्रित्य च शुद्धपाठस्य निर्धारणं कृतम् । ]

(1) Matsya ch. 24, śl.47: In the story of King Raji, third son of Āyus, the son of Purūravas, it is said that Indra became a son of Raji and that when between Indra as son of Raji and Raji's former sons who were a hundred, conflict arose, Indra sought Br̥haspati's assistance, and Br̥haspati confounded these hundred sons by propagating among them the non-Vedic Jina-dharma. The reference is to Buddhism or Jainism.

गत्वाथ मोहयामास रजिपुत्रान् बृहस्पतिः ।

जिनधर्मं समास्थाय वेदबाह्यं स वेदवित् ॥

वेदत्रयी परिभ्रष्टान् चकार धिषणाधिपः ।

वेदबाह्यान् परिज्ञाय हेतुवादसमन्वितान् ॥

जघान शक्रो वज्रेण सर्वान् धर्मबहिष्कृतान् ॥ 24. 47-9.

While the Bhāgavata (IX. 17. 1, 12-15) makes a brief reference to Raji and his sons, and Indra destroying them after they had been made apostate through the intervention of Br̥haspati—

अवधीद् अंशितान् मार्गात् न कश्चिदवशेषितः,

---

\* See my first article entitled 'Gleanings from the Matsya Purāṇa,' in the inaugural issue of this Bulletin.

the three Purāṇas, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Viṣṇu have a detailed account of the Devāsura conflict at the time of Rāji, of Rāji's help to Indra, of Indra becoming his adopted son, of Rāji's former sons opposing Indra and of Br̥haspati confounding Rāji's sons and making them renegades. The account in the two former Purāṇas is in verse and in third in prose, and in all of them Rāji's sons are five hundred and not just hundred as in the Matsya (ĀSS). None of the mss. of the Matsya collated by us, except only one which reads पञ्चशतं instead of पुत्रशतं, has a reading mentioning them as five hundred, as other Purāṇas do. In none of these accounts however does the story say that these Vedic out-castes were made so by teaching them Jina-dharma; this seems to be a further 'pariṣkāra' of the Matsya. Of the Matsya mss. collated by us fifteen read Jina-dharma and ten only 'adharma' in general. The Vāyu (92. 74-99) and the Brahmāṇḍa (67. 80-105) have identical verses on this :—

तेषां च बुद्धिसंमोहमकरोद्बुद्धिसत्तमः ।

ते यदा ससृता मूढा रोगान्मत्ता विधर्मिणः ।

ब्रह्मद्विषश्च संवृत्ताः—

॥ 97-98.

The Viṣṇu (IV. 9. 20) says :

ते चापि तेन बुद्धिमोहेनाभिभूयमानाः ब्रह्मद्विषो धर्मत्यागिनो वेदवाद-  
पराङ्मुखा बभूवुः ।

The Harivamśa's verses on this are such as to convey the idea that this wrong teaching given by Br̥haspati is the well-known Cārvāka philosophy which has always been associated with him :

तेषां च बुद्धिसंमोहमकरोत् द्विजसत्तमः ।

नास्तिवादार्थशास्त्रं हि धर्मविद्वेषणं परम् ॥

परमं तर्कशास्त्राणामसतां तन्मनोऽनुगम् ।

× × ×  
ते तद्ब्रह्मस्पतिकृतं शास्त्रं श्रुत्वा ह्यचेतसः ।

पूर्वोक्तधर्मशास्त्राणामभवन् द्वेषिणः सदा ॥



The Padma alone has verses close to those of the Matsya, specifically mentioning Jina-dharma. It is thus not conclusive that either Buddhism or Jainism is referred to here. The greatest common measure is represented by 'a path opposed to the Vedic' and 'Indra doing something against those opposed to the Vedic'. This of course is a very ancient idea having wide-spread occurrence in Vedic literature, Saṁhitā, Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad,<sup>1</sup>—Indra giving away to Sālāvṛkas the Yatis described as Aruṇmagha or Aruṇmukha, the last obscure term being interpreted in a variety of ways.

(ii) There are, in the midst of the bewildering myths and stories in the epics and Purāṇas, some leading ideas which are like some basic synthesising schemes serving to interlink, co-ordinate and supply the key to the motif, meaning and movement of some myth-cycles. The following is one such idea :

Towards the end of Ch. 47, the periodic divine manifestations and incarnations are described. In each case, it is to be noted that the Matsya Purāṇa mentions one or two as Purohita or Purassara, teacher, priest (or fore-runner ?). Śls. 237ff.

<i>Avatāra</i>	<i>Purassara or Purohita</i>
Nārāyaṇa	Brahmā
Narasimha	Rudra
Vāmana	Dharma

The following manifestations are, it is interesting to note, mentioned as seven manifestations of divinity among men (mānuṣa) and as being the result of some curse :

मानुषाः सप्त यान्यास्तु शापनास्तान्निबोधत ।

- 
1. Rv. V. 34.4 Kr. Yv. II. iv. 9.2. VI. ii. 7.5. MS. I. 10. 12. Kāthaka viii. 5 etc. Aitareya Brāh. vii. 28. Śatapatha I. 2. 13. Jaim. Brāh. ii. 134. Tāndya-M. B. viii. 1. 4, xii. 4. 16 etc. Kaus. Up. III i. Śānk. Śr. Śu. XVI. 50. 2. See *Ind. Stud.* I pp. 410 ff. III. pp. 465-6; XIII. 191. *JAOS*, XIX ii. 118 ff. *Indrasya kibiṣṭāṇi* § 3 esp. p. 123 ff. *SBE*, I p. 193 fn. 2.

These seven are :

*Manifestation*

Dattātreyā

Mādhātā

Jāmadagnya

Rāma

Vedavyāsa

Buddha

Kalkin.

*Purohita*

Mārkaṇḍeya

Uttāṅka (Tathya or

Utathya in Vāyu)

Viśvāmitra

Vasiṣṭha

Jātūkarma

*Dvaipāyana*

Pāraśariya and Yājñavalkya (Vāyu reads only the latter).

The whole scheme of pairing a Purohita as an adjunct of each Avatāra, the classification of the first three of these as full divine manifestations (divyāḥ sambhūtanāḥ) and the rest as human and as associated with a curse, and some of the Purohitas, especially Dvaipāyana for Buddha are all extremely interesting. However, the above passage is not without its textual difficulty. It may be seen that the above list omits Kṛṣṇa, that two Purohitas are given to Kalkin and that Dvaipāyana is given as Purohita of the Buddha. In the reading recorded in ĀSS. edn. itself, the line apparently difficult to be construed as going with the Buddha :

देवसुन्दररूपेण द्वैपायनपुरस्सरः ।

is given two variants, one making it more intelligible in its application to the Buddha : देवतासुररूपेण, and another introducing the missing Kṛṣṇa देवक्या वसुदेवेन, though this latter reading would make the seven manifestations into eight. The bulk (19) of the mss. of Matsya collated by us have the reading देवक्या वसुदेवेन. Fourteen mss., though not all of them among the nineteen mentioned above, read विधौ नवमके instead of बुद्धौ नवमके, thus eliminating the Buddha altogether and keeping the number seven. In Vāyu too, whose ch. 98 corresponds exactly to the latter part of this ch. (47th) of Matsya, the difficulty is got over by omitting the Buddha altogether and reading instead several verses on Kṛṣṇa.

The difficulty of two Purohitas for Kalkin found in Matsya is also absent from Vāyu which reads पाराशर्यपुरस्सरः of the Matsya (verse 248) as पाराशर्यः प्रतापवान् and having only Yājñavalkya for Kalkin.

(iii) The conception of *Pañcavīras* was once prominent in ancient Indian religion, and among the rather scanty references to it are those found in the Purāṇas. The Matsya has a reference to the *Pañcavīras* in 47. 23-4 :

प्रद्युम्नस्य तु दायादो वैदर्भ्यां बुद्धिसत्तमः ।  
 अनिरुद्धो रणेऽरुद्धो जज्ञेऽस्य मृगकेतनः ॥  
 काश्या सुपार्श्वतनया साम्बाहलेभे तरस्विनः ।  
 सत्यप्रकृतयो देवाः पञ्चवीराः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥

Here in line 3, the text should read साम्बं लेभे तरस्विनम्, for Sāmba is one of the *Pañca-Vīras* or the five Vṛṣṇi heroes. Lines 1 and 2 mention two others, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. The two others are the two brothers Kṛṣṇa or Vāsudeva and Balarāma or Saṅkarṣaṇa. These five Vṛṣṇi-heroes were deified and worshiped in a group and there are epigraphical and literary references to shrines dedicated to them. To those mentioned by Dr. J. N. Banerji in his paper 'The Holy Pañcavīras of the Vṛṣṇis' in the *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art*, X. 1942, pp. 65 ff., may be added the reference to a Pañcavīrakoṣṭha or a temple dedicated to them and a dance recital there found in Daṇḍin's Daśakumāracarita, II, Apahāravarman story. In the last line also of the Matsya text quoted above, there is a corruption; सत्यप्रकृतयो देवाः must be मर्त्यप्रकृतयो देवाः, for all the Purāṇas referring to them mention them as 'human manifestations raised to divinity.' See Vāyu whose ch. 97 corresponds exactly to Matsya, ch. 47, former part :—

मनुष्यप्रकृतीन् देवान् कीर्त्यमानान् निबोधत ।  
 सङ्कर्षणो वासुदेवः प्रद्युम्नः साम्ब एव च ॥  
 अनिरुद्धश्च पञ्चैते वंशवीराः प्रकीर्तिताः । 1-2

(iv) In my former paper (pp. 83-4), I drew attention to the mention of the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa in the Matsya-text and the passages in Matsya bearing the impress of Vālmiki's epic. The description of the burning of Tripura and its similarity to the burning of Laṅkā by Hanumān was mentioned (Matsya 188 and Sundara 53). An earlier context describing fire in a similar manner is Matsya 140. 58ff. which too can be compared with Sundara 53 and Yuddha 75. But a long passage in the Matsya bearing palpably the impress of Vālmiki should be specially mentioned, viz. the context in Matsya where the Purāṇa described Moon-Light and the sights and scenes in Tripura-city at that time (ch. 139, verses 15ff.), which has close parallels with and reproductions of expressions from the description of Moon-light in Laṅkā when Hanumān entered it, in the beginning of the Sundarakāṇḍa of the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa. The same metre as used in Vālmiki, and the rhymes at ends of the feet, are employed in Matsya also. While the whole sequence is modelled on Vālmiki, the following striking parallels and reproductions may be specially cited.

<i>Matsya</i>	<i>V.R. Sundarakāṇḍa</i> Kumbh edn.
ch. 139. śl. 16. कुमुदालङ्कृते हंसो यथा सरसि विस्तृते ।	Canto 2. śl. 58. ददर्श चन्द्रं स हरिप्रवीरः पोष्ण्यमानं सरसीव हंसम् ।
	17. 1 ततः कुमुदषण्डामो निर्मलो निर्मलं स्वयम् ।
	प्रजगाम नभश्चन्द्रो
	हंसो नीलमिवोदकम् ॥
	Goressio 11.60 } हंसो यथा राजति N.W. 3.4 } पुष्करस्थः
" " सिंहो यथा चोपविष्टो वैदूर्यशिखरे महान् ।	Kumbh. 5 4. सिंहो यथा मन्दर- कन्दरस्थः ।
24. वीणा प्रलापेषु च मूर्छितेषु }	9. तन्त्रीस्वनाः कर्णसुखाः
31. तन्त्री प्रलापाः त्रिपुरेषु रक्ताः }	प्रवृत्ताः
24. मत्तप्रलापेषु	11. मत्तप्रलापान्
25. ज्योत्स्नावितानेन जगद्धितस्य	2.57. ज्योत्स्नावितानेन वितत्य लोकम्

Compare also Matsya 161.89, the expression कनकविमलहारभूषिताङ्गम् and Sundara 20.36 : कनकविमलहारभूषिताङ्गी.

(v) Echoes of the Bhagavadgītā have already been pointed out (Vol. I of this Bulletin, p. 82). Here is one clear echo of the Gītā verse या निशा सर्वभूतानाम् etc.—

रात्र्या यया चाभिरताश्च लोका

भवन्ति कामाभिजिताः सुखेन च ।

तामेव रात्रिं प्रयतेत विद्वान्

अरण्यसंस्थो भवितुं यतात्मा ॥ 40. 6

(vi) In the previous article (p. 85), it was pointed out that the Matsya mentioned sage Bharata, author of the Nāṭya Śāstra and his production of the play Lakṣmīsvayamvara. There is another reference to this Bharata as Brahmā's son, one born of Brahmā's hand. Matsya III. 11 :

भरतः करमध्यात्तु ब्रह्मसूनु रभूततः ।

The description of Bharata as born of Brahmā's hand is significant as *Kara* or *Hasta* is most prominently associated with sage Bharata and his art of *abhinaya*.

(vii) In the previous paper, the likelihood of the Matsya text having known classical Nāṭakas and Kāvyaś like those of Kālidāsa (especially his Kumārasambhava), Amaru and even Somadeva was shown. It would appear that the text knew also Jayadeva's Gītagovinda. In 154. 464 ff. the Purāṇa describes in the style of the Raghuvamśa and the Kumārasambhava, the coming out of Śiva for the marriage and the women in diverse activities looking on Śiva. Strangely the text here closely echoes the description of Jayadeva's description of the līlās and ceṣṭās of the different Gopīs who were enjoying Kṛṣṇa's company in the Rāsakīlā, I, (Candanacarcita etc.) Not only is the series काचिद् or कापि reminiscent of the lines in the Gītagovinda but the rhythm of the metrical pattern too. The Purāṇa-line सप्रणयं करवद्वितवक्त्रः किञ्चिदुवाच मितं श्रुतिमूले (477) recalls at once Jayadeva's कापि कपोलतले मिलिता लपितुं श्रुतिमूले.

The further description of Śiva's marriage (śls. 473 ff) is patterned after the Kumārasambhava pretty closely. e.g. the following may be compared :

Matsya :	Kumārasambhava
154. 480 : ज्वलितौषधि दीपितम् (Himavān's city)	VI 38 : वप्रान्तर्ज्वलितौषधि
481 : दाता महीभृतां नाथः होता देवधनुर्मुखः । वरः पशुपतिः साक्षात् कन्या विश्वारणिस्तथा ॥	VI. 1 : दाता मे भूभृतां नाथः „ 82 : उमा वधूर्भवाच्च दाता याचितार इमे वयम् । वरः शम्भुरलं ह्येष त्वत्कुलोद्भूतये विधिः ॥

That it was the Kumārasambhava that was kept in mind all through the course of this narrative of the marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī in this long chapter 154th is clear when we compare section after section. To begin with, the gods waiting upon Brahmā and petitioning to him and then Brahmā's enquiry of the Dikpālas (śls. 19-24) which is fashioned just as in Kālidāsa's poem, though the fancies here are different : then Brahmā prophesying the appearance of the destroyer of Tāraka as the young son of Śiva on the latter marrying Pārvatī. Indra thinks of the God of love—चूनाङ्कुरास्त्रं सत्मार (śl. 208), cf. K. S. II. 64. सहचरमनुहस्तन्यस्तचूनाङ्कुरास्त्रः । Matsya 209 : उपतस्ये रतिपतिः cf. K. S. II. 64 : शतमखमुपतस्ये । Then in the context of Śiva being disturbed by Kāma's presence and controlling himself वशित्वेन बुधोपदेशो विकृति (śl. 233) where the underlined words are from K. S. III. 69 : पुनर्वशित्वाद् बलवन्निरुह्य । हेतुं वचचेतो विकृतेर्दिदृष्टुः, After the burning of Kāma, Himavān tries to go to his abode, carrying Pārvatī on his arms पाशावादाय हि सुतां गन्तुमैच्छत्स्वकं पुरम् (śl. 287) which echoes K. S. III. 75 : अद्विरादाय दोभ्याम् । In śls. 294 and 298-9, the Matsya dwells on the way the name U-Mā came to be attached to Pārvatī which can be compared with K. S. I. 26. उमेति मात्रा तपसो निषिद्धा पश्चादुमाख्याम् सुमुखी जगाम । In the description of Pārvatī's sports after marriage we have in the Purāṇa—क्रीडां चक्रे कृत्रिमपुत्रकैः (śl. 501) which is from K. S. I. 29, Pārvatī playing as a young

girl. There are transpositions and innovations like the sages testing Pārvatī's penance, instead of Śiva in disguise ; but all through, the words and ideas of K. S. are before the Purāṇa.

Indeed the poetic style of the Purāṇa and the influence of later Kāvya literature grows in several of the descriptive contexts like the description of the garden in 180. 24 ff. in diverse metres, where in verse 36, the striking device by antādi or gṛhīta-mukta, starting a line on the word ending the previous line, is employed and in verse 43, the name of the metre (Bhramaravilasita) is worked in.

(viii) References in the Matsya to different Śāstras were brought together in the previous article (I. 1. p. 82). The following are additional references in Matsya to different branches of Sanskrit literature and various Śāstras.

Sāṃkhya-Yoga is mentioned also in 13-5 ; 47. 140, 163. Nyāya is mentioned in 53. 5. On pp. 80-1 of the previous paper, an out-of-the way information on the Sāmaveda furnished by the Matsya was discussed in detail. Sāmaveda is also mentioned in Matsya as the foremost of the Vedas in 85-5. In 93. 99, Garuḍa, Viṣṇu's conveyance is described as an embodiment of the Sāmaveda. सामवनिशरीरस्त्वं वाहनं परमेष्ठिनः। The four Vedas are mentioned in 93. 128-9, and in 93. 130, the Veda and Vedāṅgas. The expression 'Vedavādin' occurs in 77. 5. One devoted to cultivation of Vedas, Vedavrata-pāra, and one who knows the Jyeṣṭha-sāman are mentioned among meritorious Brāhmaṇas in 95. 30. Itihāsa-śravaṇa as an act of piety is mentioned in 57. 15.

(ix) Followers of the diverse paths Bhāgavatas, Sauras, Vaiṣṇavas and Yogins are spoken of in 96. 21. Māheśvara Vrata and Māheśvara dharmas as expounded by Nandikeśvara are found in ch. 95. The mention of Agastya as *Lankādvāsīn* in 61. 51 is noteworthy.

(x) Among other interesting data are:—The derivation of the South Indian Pāndya, Kerala and Cola from Āṇḍira of the lunar race (48. 5) ; the mention of the rivers *Kāverī*, *Kṛṣṇaveṇī*

and Godāvarī in 51. 13 ; the references to the nine gems—Navaratnas—in connection with Ratnācala-dāna in ch. 90 and the mention of Maṭhas in 139. 20. The Kāverī noted above as mentioned in 51. 13 along with Kṛṣṇaveṇī and Godāvarī is clearly the southern river of that name, and in addition to this, the Matsya mentions also in ch. 189 the Kāverī falling into the Narmadā.

## पुराणरत्नानि

आत्मा नदी संयमपुण्यतीर्था सत्योदका शीलशमादियुक्ता ।  
तस्यां स्नातः पुण्यकर्मा पुनाति न वारिणा शुद्ध्यति चान्तरात्मा ॥

न शरीरस्य संक्लेशैरपि निर्दहन्नात्मकः ।

शुद्धिमाप्नोति पुरुषः संशुद्धं यस्य नो मनः ॥

( वामनपु०, वेंकटे०, ४३/२५, ८४ )



## Textual Notes

### THE BODY-BORN SONS OF BRAHMĀ

(MATSYA PURĀṆA, ĀN. Edn., 3. 9-12)

शारीरानथ वक्ष्यामि मातुहीनान् प्रजापतेः ।  
अयुष्ठाद् दक्षिणाद् दक्षः (१) प्रजापतिरजायत ॥१॥  
धर्मः (२) स्तनान्तादभवद्दृढ्यात्कुसुमायुधः (३) ।  
भूमध्याद्भवत्क्रोधो (४) लोभश्च (५) चाधरसंभवः ॥१०॥  
बुद्धेर्मोहः (६) समभवदहंकारादभून्मदः (७) ।  
प्रमोदश्च (८) चाभवत्कण्ठान्मृष्युर् (९) लोवनतो हृष ॥  
भरतः (१०) करमध्यात् ब्रह्मसुनुरभूत्ततः ॥११॥  
एते नव (१) सुता राजन् कन्या च दशमी पुनः ।  
अङ्गजा इति विख्याता दशमी ब्रह्मणः सुता ॥१२॥

Here the actual number of the body-born sons of Brahmā is *ten* as shown above, and not *nine* as mentioned in śl. 12 a. How, then, did this discrepancy creep in? What might have been the original text?

The third line of śl. 11 ('भरतः करमध्यात् ब्रह्मसुनुरभूत्ततः') is omitted or missing in the three North Indian Mss. D12-14<sup>1</sup> (i.e. Ms. No. 38-182 of Kāśīrāja Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍāra, Fort Ramnagar, No. 2288 of Deccan College MSS. Library, Poona, and No. E 3550 of India office Library, London) as well as in the three South-Indian MSS. D15, 20-21 (i.e. Mss. Nos. 10443, 10441, 10444 of the New D. C. of the Sarasvatī Mahal Library, Tanjore). This line is also omitted in the Telugu edition of the Matsya Purāṇa. So according to this manuscript-evidence, the number of the body-born sons of Brahmā comes to *nine* which tallies with the number mentioned in Śl. 12a. We may, therefore, safely conclude that the original or the most probable text of the Matsya Purāṇa did not contain this line which mentions भरत as a body-born son of Brahmā, born from the middle of his hand. According to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (III. 12. 23) कणु (one of the ten Prajāpatis) was born from Brahmā's hand. Moreover, भरत is no-where else is mentioned as a son of Brahmā. Even the *Nāṭyaśāstra* does not mention

1. For these symbols and descriptions of the Matsya Purāṇa MSS. Collated both at Ramnagar and at Madras see my article in PURĀṆA, Vol. I, No. I, pp. 101-111.

भरत as Brahmā's son. This line might have been interpolated to make the number *ten* of the body-born sons of Brahmā on the analogy of his ten mind-born (*mānasa*) sons called *prajāpatis* (cf. Matsya 3. 6-8 ; Bhāg. III. 12. 22-23, and Manu-Smṛti-1.35). But the next line ('एते नव सुता राजन्' śl. 12a) might have escaped the attention of the interpolator ; hence the discrepancy.

Other important variants in these lines are as follows :—

- Śl. 10 a धर्मस्तु नाभिदेशे तु (the two South Indian Mss. D 20-21).  
 ,, नाभिदेशात् (the Telugu edn.)
- 11 b अहंकारादभून्मनः (Ms. D7, i.e. No. 28 of 1871-72 in BORI, Poona ; also the Kannada and the Telugu editions).
- 11 c प्रमोदश्चाभवत्कर्णात् (Telugu edn.).  
 प्रसादश्चाभवत्कर्णात् (Ms. G<sub>1</sub>, i.e. Trivandrum Grantha Ms. No. 402 of the Palace Library).
- 12 d दशमी प्रज्ञणः सुताः (D1-2, 6-7, i.e. No. 4654 of SOL, Ujjain, No. 4146 of Bombay Univ. Lib., and New Nos. 11 and 2 of BORI, Poona ; also the Telugu edn.)  
 - 'These are the ten sons of Brahmā', i.e. the nine sons (from दक्ष to मृत्यु as given in the above śloka) and the tenth a daughter (सावित्री?) who has been also counted among the sons according to the dictum 'प्राधान्येन व्यपदेशा भवन्ति'. This reading 'अज्ञजा इति विख्याता दशमी प्रज्ञणः सुताः' ('These ten sons of Brahmā are known as *an̐gajāḥ* or body-born) seems to be more probable and correct than the Ān. reading 'अज्ञजा इति विख्याता दशमी प्रज्ञणः सुता' ('The tenth is the daughter of Brahmā known as *an̐gajāḥ* or body-born'), for the Ān. reading is merely a repetition of the idea contained in Śl. 12 b (कन्या च दशमी पुनः). Moreover, in the Ān. reading 'अज्ञजा इति....सुता' the hiatus in 'अज्ञजा इति' is untenable according to the Sandhi-rules of Pāṇini, the correct form should be 'अज्ञजेति'; while in the above variant (of Mss. D1-2, 6-7) no such difficulty arises.

## कूर्मपुराण-विषयसूची

[ श्री रामशांकर भट्टाचार्य ]

अथात्र कूर्मपुराण-विषयसूची प्रकाश्यते । १८४८ शक्रीय वैकटेश्वर-  
संस्करणमत्र व्यवहृतम् ।

संस्करणमिदमशुद्धपाठभूयिष्ठम् । तथाहि प्राचेतसदक्षकन्यानामगणनश्लोके  
खसा नाम न पठ्यते (पृ१६।१७) । दक्षकन्यान्यवर्णनं प्रसंगे (पृ१८।१३)  
अपि खसा नाम नास्ति । सर्वत्र खसा स्थाने तथेति पठ्यते । अत्र पुराणान्तर-  
संवादेन अस्माभिः खसेति पाठः स्थापितः । एवं क्वचित् अन्यत्रापि पाठसमीक्षा  
सूच्यामस्माभिः कृता ।

न केवलमत्र पाठाशुद्धयः प्रत्युत अध्यायश्लोकसंख्या-निर्देशेऽपि अन्तरां  
अन्तरा प्रमादा दृश्यन्ते ।<sup>१</sup> अस्माभिस्तु सर्वत्र शुद्धायाः संख्याया एव निर्देशो  
विहितः, अतो यदि क्वचन सूचीप्रदत्ताकरनिर्देशानुसारेण आकरस्थलं न  
दृष्टिपथमागच्छेत् तर्हि एतन्-निर्देशमनुसृत्याकरस्थलान्वेषणे यत्नो विधेयः ।

### व्यवहृतसंकेतचिह्न-विवरणम्

१. आकर निर्देशे 'पू' 'उ' संकेताभ्यां यथाक्रमं पूर्वार्ध-उत्तरार्धौ ज्ञेयौ ।
२. तथैव स्थूलोऽङ्कः अध्यायसंख्याज्ञापकः, तदनन्तरं सूक्ष्मोऽङ्कश्च श्लोकसंख्या-  
ज्ञापकः ।
३. (        ) एतादृशे कोष्ठके उपात्त-विषयस्य प्रासङ्गिकं विवरणं प्रदत्तम् ।
४. [        ] एतादृशे कोष्ठके पाठान्तरादिविषयकं विवेचनं कृतम् ।
५. — इति वैशिष्ट्यं विषयानुवृत्तिज्ञापकम् ।
६. ३० = ३० व्यम् ।

(१) पृ१५।९९ श्लोकस्थाने १५।९९ अङ्को मुद्रितः । उ।४६।१४६ श्लोकाङ्कः  
४६।१४३ रूपेण मुद्रितः । तथैव उ।४६।१३२ श्लोकाङ्कः ४६।३२ रूपेण मुद्रितः । पृ१६  
अध्याये शतसंख्यानन्तरं १०१ संख्या लेखनीया, परन्तु १ संख्या मुद्रिता । द्वितीये  
शतके सर्वत्र इत्यमेव श्लोकाङ्कः प्रदत्तः । पुराणान्तरेष्वपि क्वचित् इयमेव शैली दृश्यते ;  
सा च नितरां भ्रमजनिका । पूर्वार्धे षोडशाध्याय-पुष्पिकायां २६ संख्या मुद्रिता ।  
पृ२४।१२ स्थले ८२ श्लोकसंख्या मुद्रिता । उ।२३।६४, ६९ स्थले यथाक्रमं ६०, ६७  
संख्ये मुद्रिते । ग्रन्थस्यान्तिमे पत्रे ( मार्जिनस्थले ) अध्यायसंख्या ३४ इति  
मुद्रिता, सा च संख्या ४६ भवेत् ।

## प्रथमः खण्डः—सर्ग-प्रतिसर्गौ

### विभागः—सर्गः

#### ब्रह्मकर्तृकसृष्टिः [सर्गप्रकरणान्तर्गता]

- प्राकृतःसर्गः, (अष्टदिपूर्वकः; ब्रह्ममहिमा, ब्रह्मनामनिर्वचनं च) ।  
[अत्र ब्रह्मा = हिरण्यगर्भः पू० ४।४९; क्षेत्रज्ञश्च पू० ४।३७; अयमेव  
विष्णु-नारायणरूपेण सर्गप्रकरणेऽभिधीयते] पू० ४।१-१६
- ब्रह्मकर्तृक-चराचरमरीच्यादि-सृष्टिः (वेदाविर्भावश्च) पू० २।२२-३६
- ब्रह्मणा दक्षादयःसृष्ट्यौ विनियोजिताः (ब्रह्मविष्णुरुक्षाणां रूपमैक्यं च) पू० २।८८-९८
- ब्रह्मायुःपरिमाणकथनम् (परार्धकालकथनं, कालपरिमाणैः सह) पू० ५।३-२६
- ब्रह्मकर्तृक-नवसर्गाः (बुद्धिपूर्वकाः, ते च प्राकृतवैकृतकुमारनामधेयाः) पू० ७।१-१९
- ब्रह्म-कर्तृक-प्रजासर्गाः (स्वायंभुवमनुसर्गाश्च प्राक्, अत्र मुख्यतः  
शरीरमानस-प्रजासृष्टिः, देवासुरमानुषपितृसृष्टिः,  
रक्षोयक्षगन्धर्वभूतादिसृष्टिः, यज्ञवेदादिसृष्टिश्च) पू० ७।१९-७०
- वराहकर्तृकपृथिव्युद्धारः [अर्थं वराह एव, न यज्ञवराहः, वराहः =  
ब्रह्मा = नारायणः] पू० ६।१-२५
- ब्रह्मतः स्वायम्भुवमनुजन्म (मनुकन्यान्वयः, अस्य द्वौ पुत्रौ द्वे कन्ये च) पू० ८।१-३०
- ब्रह्मकर्तृका रुद्रादीनां सृष्टिः (मधुकैटभवधानन्तरं; नीललोहितरुद्रसर्गः,  
ब्रह्मकर्तृकादिसृष्टिः, नारायणख्येन ब्रह्मणा भूत्वादिसृष्टिः) पू० १०।७-९०

#### प्रजापति-कर्तृक-सर्गाः [सर्गप्रकरणीयाः]

अग्निः [=वह्निः]

—दक्षकन्यास्वाहापतिर्वह्निः अस्य पुत्राश्च; [पू० ८।१७-२० अपि द्र०] पू० १३।१४-१८

अश्विनः

—दक्षकन्यास्मृतिपतिः, अस्य वंदाश्च [पू० ८।१७-२० अपि द्र०] पू० १३।८-९

—दक्षकन्याद्वयपतिः ; तरयापत्यम् [ पू१८१८ पाठो अष्टः

सम्यक्पाठस्तु विष्णुपुराणे १।१५।१३६ ]

पू१६।६ ; पू१८।१८

अग्निः

—दक्षकन्या-अनसूयापतिः अस्य पुत्राश्च [ पू१८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ] पू१३।७-८

अधर्मः

—हिंसापतिः, अधर्मतो निकृत्यादीनां जन्म

[ हिंसाविषये पू१८।५ अपि द्र० ]

पू१८।२५-२९

अरिष्टनेमिः [०नेमिन्-पाठा०]

—दक्षकन्यापतिः, अस्य षोडशापत्यानि [ द्र० पाठा०,

तदेव साधु ]

पू१६।५ ; पू१८।१७

कश्यपः

—त्रयोदश-दक्षकन्यापतिः, तासां वंशाश्च

पू१६।१७-१८।१६

कृशाश्वः

—प्राचेतसदक्षकन्यापतिः देवप्रहरणोऽस्य पुत्रः

पू१६।६ ; पू१८।१९

कतुः

—दक्षकन्या-सन्तति-पतिः, अस्य पुत्राश्च [ पू१८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ]

पू१३।११

दक्षः

—अयं स्वार्थभुवमनुकन्या-प्रसूतिपतिः, यथादिचतुर्विंशतिकन्या-

जनकः, धर्मद्वयोदशकन्याः जग्माह, धर्मवंशश्च

पू१८।९-२५

—ख्यातयादि-एकादशदक्षकन्यान्वयः

पू१३।१-२४

दक्षः

—अयं प्राचेतसः, दक्षपत्यामशिकन्यां पुत्राणां षष्टिकन्यानां

च जन्म, दक्षकर्तृक-धर्मकश्यपादिभ्यः कन्यादानम्

पू१६।१-६

धर्मः

—श्रद्धादीनाम् त्रयोदशदक्षकन्यानां पतिः, धर्मवंशः

पू१८।१४-२५

—प्राचेतसदक्षकन्यापतिः, दक्षपत्नीनां पुत्राश्च

पू१३।५-१६

पितरः

—अग्निष्वात्त-वर्हिषदक्षः एषां पत्नी स्वधा, तदपत्यम्

पू१३।१९-२२

[ पू१८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ]

पुलस्त्यः

—दक्षकन्याप्रीति-पतिः, अस्य पुत्राश्च [ पू८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ] पू१३।९-१०

पुलहः

—दक्षकन्याक्षमा-पतिः अस्य पुत्राश्च [ पू८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ] पू१३।९-७

बहुपुत्रः

—दक्षकन्याद्वयपतिः, चतस्रो विद्युतोऽस्य पुत्राः, पू१६।६ ; पू१८।१८

भवः [ रुद्रोऽपि द्र० ]

—सतीपतिः पू८।१७-२०

भृगुः

—दक्षकन्याख्याति-पतिः, अस्य पुत्राश्च, [ पू८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ] पू१३।९-३

मरीचिः

—दक्षकन्यासंभूति-पतिः, अस्य पुत्राश्च, [ पू८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ] पू१३।४-५

रुचिः

—स्वायम्भुवमनुकन्या-आकृतिपतिः, ततो यज्ञदक्षिणाजन्म, ताभ्यां यामदेवानां जन्म पू८।९-१४

रुद्रः

—अर्धनारीश्वरेशानस्य प्रादुर्भावः, तत एकादशरुद्रजन्म, रुद्र-सती-विवाहश्च पू११।१-१५

—ब्रह्मणो नीललोहितरुद्र-जन्म, रुद्राणां सृष्टिः, पू७।२५-३१

—ऋद्ध-प्रजापतिमरणानन्तरं रुद्रप्रादुर्भावः, ब्रह्मणा तस्मै नामादीनि प्रदत्तानि, रुद्राणां सृष्टिः, अस्य महिमा च [ अयं नीललोहितः पू३०।३३ ] पू१०।२२-४१

वसिष्ठः

—दक्षकन्याकर्जा-पतिः, अस्य पुत्राश्च, [ पू८।१७-२० अपि द्र० ] पू१३।१२-१३

वह्निः [ =अग्निः द्र० ]

विराट्

—ब्रह्मतो जन्म, अयमेव स्वायम्भुवमनुः पू८।६-९

सौमः

—दक्षकन्यापतिः, तदपत्यम्

पू।१६।५ ; पू।१८।१७

स्वायम्भुवमनुः

—ब्रह्मतो जन्म, शतरूपापतिः, प्रियव्रतोत्तानपादपिता, रुचि-  
दक्षाभ्यां कन्याद्वयप्रदानं कृतमनेन

पू।८।१-१२

गौणः सर्गः

—विष्णुकर्तृकरुद्र-ब्रह्म-श्री-सृष्टिः ; विष्णुनिर्देशेन श्रिया जगन्मोहितम्

पू।२।१-२२

—रुद्रकर्तृकरुद्राणां सृष्टिः

पू।१०।२२-४१

## (२) विभागः—प्रतिसर्गः

प्रतिसर्गप्रकरणम् [प्रतिसर्गरोऽयम् उ।४५।४ ; नित्यादि-चतुर्विध-

प्रलयविवरणमत्र ; अन्ते शिवमहिमा, योगविवरणं च]

पू।४५।२-४६।५३

—नित्यः ( नित्य-भूतक्षयात्मकः )

उ।४५।६

—नैमित्तिकः (चतुर्युगसहस्रान्ते कल्पे ब्रह्मकर्तृकः; अनाष्टि-सूर्यताप-

संवर्तकवायु-संवर्तकमेघ-एकार्णवावस्थादि-विवरणम् ; अस्य  
लक्षणम् उ।४५।७)

उ।४५।१८-६१

—प्राकृतः (महदादिविशेषान्तक्षयात्मकः, परार्धद्वितये गते सति नील-

लोहितकर्तृकः ; एतल्लक्षणं उ।४५।८ ; पृथिव्यादितत्त्वानां  
महेश्वरकृतसंहरणं, प्रधानपुरुषवियोजनं, गुणसाम्यं च)

उ।४६।१-२४

—आत्यन्तिकः (ज्ञानहेतुको योगिनाम् ; शंकरकृतात्यन्तिकलयः ;

एतल्लक्षणम् उ।४५।९-१० ; उ।४६।२१-२३ इत्यत्र शिवमहिमा,  
योगविवरणं च)

उ।४६।२४-२५

गौणः प्रतिसर्गः [प्रतिसर्ग प्रकरणात् पृथक् प्रलय-विवरणम् ]

नास्ति

## द्वितीयःखण्डः—तीर्थ-भूगोल-भुवनकोशाः

### (१) विभागः—तीर्थम्

#### तीर्थसामान्यम्

तीर्थमाहात्म्यम् ( अनेकतीर्थानां ) पृ० ४४१-२४

तीर्थसूची पृ० २११-३७६१

तीर्थ-गणना ( प्रयागादीनि पुण्यस्थानानि ) पृ० ३१४६-४८

तीर्थफलाधिकारी उ० ३७१८-१९

तीर्थविशेषाः [ विशिष्ट-लिङ्ग-अधिष्ठातृदेवानामादिभिः सह ]

#### अमरकण्टकपर्वतः

—माहात्म्यम् उ० ४०३६-३९

—कलिङ्गदेश-पश्चार्धे अरिमन् पर्वते नर्मदा-स्थितिः

[ नर्मदामाहात्म्यमपि ( उ० ४०११-४२१४२ ) इ० ] उ० ४०१९

#### अश्वतरनागः

—प्रयागयमुनादक्षिणतटस्थः पृ० ३७१९-२१

#### अश्वतीर्थम्

—हयगिरसः नारायणस्य स्थानम् उ० ३५३८

#### अहल्यातीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थम्, अहल्यापूजादिनं च उ० ४१४३-४५

#### उमाहकम्

—इदं अक्षतीर्थं, गजकृपा शिलाऽत्र उ० ४१५६-५९

#### ऋणप्रमोचनम्

—प्रयागदक्षिणे, यमुनोत्तरतीरे पृ० ३८१४-१६

#### ऋषितीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थम्, अत्र नारदतीर्थमप्यस्ति उ० ४११५-१७



## एकान्तम्

पूर्वदेशीयशिवतीर्थम्

उ३५१२३-२४

## एरण्डीतीर्थम्, एरण्डीसंगमश्च

—नर्मदास्थम्

{ उ३५१८५-८७  
उ३५२३१-३२

## ओङ्कारलिङ्गम्

—वाराणस्याम्, व्यासेनार्चितम्, पञ्चायतनविग्रहम्,  
मत्स्योदरीतटस्थम्

पू३२११-११

## कनखलम्

—दक्षयज्ञनाशोऽत्र

उ३५१०-११-

## कन्यातीर्थम्

—इदं जामदग्न्यरामसम्बन्धि (?)

उ३५१९-१०

## कपर्दीश्वरलिङ्गम्

—वाराणसीस्थित-पिशाचमोचनस्थम्, शङ्खकर्ण-चरितं च

पू३३११-५३

## कपालमोचनम्

—शिवतीर्थं, भैरवेणात्र कपालं स्थापितम्

उ३५१२४-२६

—वाराणसीस्थम् ; एतन्नामकारणं

उ३५११-१०८

## कपिलातीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थम्

उ३५१९३-१००

## कपिला नदी

—नर्मदादक्षिणकूलस्था

उ३५१२४-२६

## कम्बलनागः

—प्रयागे यमुनादक्षिणतटस्थः

पू३५११९-२१

## कायावरोहणम्

—माहेश्वरधर्मप्रवर्तनमत्र

उ३५१७-८

## कालञ्जरम्

—माहात्म्यं, एतन्नामकारणम्, श्वेतवृषचरितं च

उ३६१११-३८

## कालसर्पिः

—कश्यपस्य तीर्थम्

उ३७३४-३६

## कावेरी

—पुष्पा नदी

उ३७।१६-१७

## कावेरीनर्मदासंगमः

—शिवतीर्थम्

उ३७।४०

## कुब्जाश्रमः

—विष्णुस्थानं, अत्र दक्षयज्ञमथनम्, समन्ताद् योजनं क्षेत्रम्

उ३५।३३-३५

## कुरुतीर्थम् (=कुरुक्षेत्रम् ?)

—माहात्म्यम्

उ३५।५-६

## कृत्तिवासेश्वरलिङ्गम्

—वाराणसीस्थं, कृत्तिवासनाम-कारणम्

पू३२।१२-२९

## केदारम्

—शिवतीर्थम्

उ३५।५-७

—नर्मदास्थम्

उ३१।०-९

## गङ्गा

—व्योमगङ्गोत्पत्तिः [३० वाराणसी-प्रयागौ]

पू३७।५५-५६

## गङ्गावदनम्

—गङ्गेश्वरसमीपस्थं, नर्मदास्थम्

उ३१।१०२-१०४

## गङ्गेश्वरम्

—नर्मदास्थम्

उ३२।१००-१०२

## गया

—माहात्म्यं पितृगाथा च

उ३५।७-१५

## गोकर्णम्

—शिवस्थानम्, गोवर्णोत्तरे स्थाणुलिङ्गम्

उ३५।२१-२९

—गौतमस्यस्थानम्, युवनाश्वोऽत्र गौतमं ब्रह्ममागतः

पू३०।१२-१३

## गौतमेश्वरम्

—नर्मदास्थं, गौतमसिद्धिस्थानम्

उ३२।६-८

## चन्द्रतीर्थम्

—कावेरीप्रभवस्थम्

उ३७।२३

## जप्येश्वरम्

—नामकारणम्, नन्दिचरितं च

उ।४३।१७-४२

जमदग्निः—नर्मदोदधिसंगमो द्र०

उ।४२।३३-३४

## जलेश्वर-हृदः

—अमरकण्टकपश्चिमस्थः

उ।४०।२२-२३

## ताम्रपर्णी

—पितृतर्पणस्थानम्

उ।३७।२१-२२

## त्रैयम्बकम्

—सुवर्णाक्षशिवपूजास्थानम्; [सुवर्णाक्षमिति पाठा०]

उ।३५।१८-१९

## दशाश्रमेधिकम्

—रुद्रस्थानं, नर्मदारथं, गङ्गावदनपश्चिमस्थम्

उ।४१।१०४-१०७

## देवदारुवनम्

—शिवकर्तृकमुनिमोहनम् [उ।३८ अध्याये देवदारुवनलीला शिवस्य]

उ।३७।५३-६१

—हिमवत्शिखरस्थम्

पू।२०।४९

## धर्मवनम्

—हिमवत्पृष्ठस्थं, अत्र मन्दाकिनी अस्ति

पू।१४।२६-२७

## धौतपापम्

—नर्मदारथं, एतन्नामकारणं च

उ।४२।९-१२

## नकुलीश्वरम्

—हिमवच्छिखरे गङ्गाद्वारे, नकुलीश्वरस्थानम्

उ।४४।१२-१४

## नन्दितीर्थम्

—नन्दीशत्रियस्थानम्

उ।४१।९०-९२

## नर्मदा

—पाहाट्म्यं, नर्मदास्थानि तीर्थानि च, अस्याः परिमाणम्,  
अमरकण्टकात् प्रभवति, रुद्रगात्रविनिष्क्रान्ता

उ।४०।१-४२।४२

## नर्मदोदधिसंगमः

—जमदग्निरितिनामान्तरम्, विष्णुसिद्धिस्थानम्

उ।४२।३३-३४

नारदतीर्थम्

—इ० ऋषितीर्थम्

डा४१/१५-१७

नैमिषम्

—शिवप्रियम्, एतन्नामकारणम्

डा४३/१-१६

पञ्चतपः

—शिवतीर्थम्

डा४४/५-६

पञ्चनदम्

—ज्येष्ठरसमीपस्थम्

डा४४/१-२

पिशाचमोचनम्

—बाराणसीस्थम्, (बाह्मकृष्णचरितं च, कपदीश्वरलिङ्ग-  
माहात्म्येन सह)

पू३३/१-५३

पुरुषोत्तमतीर्थम्

—विष्णुलोकप्रदायकम्

डा३५/२७-२८

पुष्करम्

—ब्रह्मतीर्थम्

डा३५/३९-४४

सूक्ष्मप्रलवणम्

—अत्र सरस्वत्याः विनश्यनम्

डा३५/२९

प्रमासः

—सिद्धावास-शिवस्थानम्

डा३५/१६-१७

प्रतिष्ठानम्

—प्रयागगङ्गापूर्वपार्श्वस्थम्

पू३७/२२-२३

प्रयागः

—प्रयागान्तर्गत-तीर्थानि, प्रयागमहिमा,  
प्रजापतिदेवम् (पू३६/२०)

पू३६/१-३६/१८

—प्रलयोवनविस्तीर्णताऽस्य

डा३५/४

नदर्याश्रमः

—नरनारायणस्थानम्

डा३७/५०-५१

बाणतीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थम्

डा४१/१५-११

July, 1961]

कूर्मपुराण-विषयसूची

843

भारभूतिम् [भारभूतिज-पाठा०]

—नर्मदास्थम्

डा०४२।२५-३०

भृगुतीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थं, भृगुकृतस्मृद्वाराधनमन्त्र

डा०४२।१-६

मध्यमेश्वरलिङ्गम्

—वाराणसीस्थं, व्यासपूजितम्, एतन्माहात्म्यं च

पू०३४।१-३१

मन्दाकिनी

—हिमवत्-पृष्ठस्थधर्मवनस्था

पू०१४।२५-२७

महाभैरवम् [महाभारत-पाठा०]

—शिवतीर्थम् [शक्रतीर्थमितिपाठा०]

डा०४४।३

महालयः

—शिवतीर्थम्

डा०३७।१-४

मुण्डपृष्ठम्

—गयास्थं, महादेवपदन्यासोऽत्र

डा०३७।३९-४३

यमुना

—प्रयागस्था; ब्र० प्रयागमाहात्म्यम्

पू०३६।१-३९।१९

योधीपुरम् [योधनी-योधना-पाठा०]

—नर्मदास्थम्, क्षुरा योधिता विष्णुनाऽत्र

डा०४१।५२-५४

रामेश्वरम्

—महोदधिस्थम्

डा०३०।२३

रुद्रकोटिः

शिवस्य कोटिरुपात्मकत्वं, ततश्चैतन्नाम

डा०३६।१-८

वाराणसी

—अत्र कपालमोचनमस्ति ; ब्रह्महत्यायुतः शिवोऽत्रागतः

डा०३१।३-१०७

—वाराणसी-माहात्म्यं, तदन्तर्गत-तीर्थानां लिङ्गानां च

माहात्म्यं, व्यासचरितं च ; व्यासकाशी पू०३५।२९ ;

वरणासीमध्यस्था पू०३१।६३

पू०३१।१-३५।३३

—परमा पुरी, एतन्माहात्म्यं पुरस्तादुक्तम्

डा०४४।१७-१८

—अस्यां पुर्यां विश्वेश्वरलिङ्गमस्ति

पू०२३।४१-४२

विजयम्

—विजयलिङ्गस्थानम्

उ३५।२१-२२

वितस्ता

—हिमालयजाता

पू४४।४

विरजा

—पूर्वदेशीया नदी, अत्र पुरुषोत्तमतीर्थम्

उ३५।२३-२८

विशाल्यकरणी

—नर्मदाक्षेत्रस्था नदी

उ४०।२७-३०

विष्णुतीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थं, अत्र वासुदेवासुरयुद्धानि बह्वनि

उ४१।५२-५३

वृषतीर्थम्

—देविकास्थम्

उ३७।२५

व्यासतीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थं, व्यासेन हुङ्कारिता नदी निवर्तिताऽत्र

उ४१।२५-२७

शुक्लतीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थं, शिवस्थानम्

उ४१।६७-८३

श्रीपर्वतम्

—शिवप्रियम्

उ३७।१३-१४

श्वेताश्वतराश्रमः

—मन्दाकिनीदक्षिणतीरस्थः

{ पू१४।२७-२८  
पू१४।३२ अपि द्र.

सप्तसारस्वतम्

—माहात्म्यं, मङ्गणकतपःस्थानम्

उ३५।४४-७६

सुषुम्ना पुष्करिणी

—हिमवत्स्था

उ३७।४७-४९

सोमतीर्थम्

—नर्मदास्थम्

उ४१।४७-५०

स्वामितीर्थम्

—स्कन्दतीर्थं, अत्र कुमारधारा

उ३७।१९-२१

हिमवान्

—१०८० योजनायतः, अत्र सुषुम्नापुष्करिण्यस्ति

पृ३७।४६-५०

(२) विभागः—भूगोलः (यानि स्थानानि तीर्थत्वेन नोक्तानि,  
भूसंबद्धा अन्ये विषयाश्च)

भूसामान्यम्

वराहकर्तृकपृथिव्युद्धारः

पृ६।१-२५

पृथिवील्यः

३० प्रतिसर्गः

भूविशेषाः

कैलासः

—अयं मेरुशिखरविशेषः

पृ२६।१

गङ्गा

—उपमन्यु-आश्रम-समीपस्था

पृ२५।१३

गङ्गाद्वारम्

—दक्षयज्ञस्थलम्

पृ११।४७

गौडदेशः

—सावस्तिनाऽत्र पुरी निर्मिता [ ३० पाठान्तरम् ]

पृ२०।१९

द्वारवती

—वर्णनम्

पृ२६।३३-३९

लङ्कापुरी

—सागरसंस्थिता

पृ२१।३७

श्रावस्तिपुरी [ ३० पाठान्तराणि ]

पृ२०।१९

—गौडदेशस्था, सावस्तिनिर्मिता

(३) विभागः—भुवनकोशः [भुवनकोशीय-धर्मदेवादयो विषयाः

चरितानि च तत् तत् खण्डे द्रष्टव्यानि]

—भुवनकोशप्रकरणम्

पृ४०।१-५०।२६

—भुवनकोशसम्बद्धाः प्रश्नाः

पृ४०।२-४

—भुवनकोशपरिशिष्टम् ( लोकालोकविशेष-अण्डादयः )

पृ५०।१२-२६

**जनपदः**

—भारतवर्षीया जनपदाः [वर्षान्तराणामेतादृशं विवरणं नास्ति,  
स्रक्षद्विद्वीपवर्णने जनपदपदं क्वचिद् दृश्यते, न पुनर्जनपदगणना] पू॥४७॥४१-४४

**तीर्थपुण्यस्थानानि**

—जैगीषव्याश्रमः पू॥४८॥१८-२२

**द्वीपः**

—सप्तद्वीपाधिपतयः, वर्षाधिपतिभिः सह पू॥४०॥१-४७  
—सप्तद्वीपनामानि पू॥४५॥२  
—द्वीपसमुद्रसम्बन्धः पू॥४५॥३-५

**द्वीपाः (सप्त)**

—जम्बूः ( जम्बूद्वीपान्तर्गत-वर्ष-पर्वत-जनपद-नद्यादि-वर्णनम् ) पू॥४५॥६-४८॥६२  
—स्रक्षः ( एतदन्तर्गत-वर्ष-पर्वत-नदी-धर्म-देव-मानवायुरादि-  
विवरणमत्र ) पू॥४६॥१-१२  
—शात्मलः ” पू॥४६॥१२-१९  
—कुशाः ” पू॥४९॥१९-२६  
—क्रौञ्चः ” पू॥४६॥२६-३२  
—शाकः ” पू॥४९॥३३-७२  
—पुष्करः ” पू॥५०॥१-१२

**द्वीपान्तराणि**

—श्वेतद्वीपः ( शाकद्वीपीयक्षीरोद-सागरमध्यस्थः ; एतद्विवरणम् ) पू॥४६॥४०-७२  
—इन्द्रद्वीपादयो नव द्वीपाः पू॥४७॥२४-२५

**नदी [ उपनदी-क्षुद्रनदी शब्दावपि व्यवहृतौ क्वचित् पुराणे ]**

—जम्बूद्वीपीयाः—३० जम्बूद्वीपः पू॥४५॥६-४८॥६२  
—स्रक्षद्वीपीयाः—३० स्रक्षद्वीपः पू॥४६॥१-१२  
—शात्मलद्वीपीयाः—३० शात्मलद्वीपः पू॥४६॥१२-१९  
—कुशद्वीपीयाः—३० कुशद्वीपः पू॥४९॥१९-२६  
—क्रौञ्चद्वीपीयाः—३० क्रौञ्चद्वीपः पू॥४६॥२६-३२  
—शाकद्वीपीयाः—३० शाकद्वीपः पू॥४६॥३३-७२  
—भारतवर्षीयाः ( विशेषेण वर्णिताः ) पू॥४७॥२८-४०



## नदीनामानि [ विशिष्टानि ]

—गङ्गा ( विष्णुपादविनिःसृता, ततः सीतादयः चतस्रो नद्यः ) पृ० ४६।२०-३३

## नरकः

—पातालाश्रयस्थिताः कूर्मायाः, पातालाश्रयस्थशेषोऽपि पृ० ४४।२५-२९

## पर्वतः

—जम्बूद्वीपीयाः—द्र० जम्बूद्वीपः ( वर्षपर्वत-मर्यादापर्वत-कुलपर्वतादयः ) पृ० ४५।६-४८।६२  
 —लक्षद्वीपीयाः ( वर्षपर्वताः )—द्र० लक्षद्वीपः पृ० ४६।१-१२  
 —शाल्मलद्वीपीयाः „ —द्र० शाल्मलद्वीपः पृ० ४६।१२-१९  
 —कुशद्वीपीयाः „ —द्र० कुशद्वीपः पृ० ४६।१९-२६  
 —कौश्वद्वीपीयाः „ —द्र० कौश्वद्वीपः पृ० ४६।२६-३२  
 —शाकद्वीपीयाः „ —द्र० शाकद्वीपः पृ० ४६।३२-७२  
 —पुष्करद्वीपीयाः „ —द्र० पुष्करद्वीपः पृ० ५०।१-१२  
 —भारतवर्षायाः ( कुलपर्वताः ) पृ० ४७।२३-२४

## पर्वतनामानि [ विशिष्टानि ]

—मेरुः ( मेरुस्थवन-पर्वत-सरो-नदी-पुर्यादिविवरणैः सह ) पृ० ४५।६-४६।४०

## पुरी

—मेरुस्थाः पुर्यो ब्रह्मशिबेन्द्रादीनाम् [ ४८ अध्यायोऽपि द्र० ] पृ० ४६।१-२७

## पृथिवी

—एतत्परिमाणम् पृ० ४५।५

## वनानि-वृक्षाश्च

—मेरुस्थानि वनानि पृ० ४५।२२-२३

## वर्षम् [ जनपदपदमपि क्वचित् ]

—वर्षाधिपतयः [ सप्तद्वीपानाम् ] पृ० ४०।१-४७  
 —जम्बूद्वीपीयानि—द्र० जम्बूद्वीपः पृ० ४५।६-४८।६२  
 —लक्षद्वीपीयानि—द्र० लक्षद्वीपः पृ० ४६।१-१२  
 —शाल्मलद्वीपीयानि—द्र० शाल्मलद्वीपः पृ० ४६।१२-१९  
 —कुशद्वीपीयानि—द्र० कुशद्वीपः पृ० ४६।१९-२६  
 —कौश्वद्वीपीयानि—द्र० कौश्वद्वीपः पृ० ४६।२६-३२  
 —शाकद्वीपीयानि—द्र० शाकद्वीपः पृ० ४६।३२-७२  
 —पुष्करद्वीपीये—द्र० पुष्करद्वीपः पृ० ५०।१-१२

## वर्षनामानि [ विशिष्टानि ]

—भारतम् ( नदी-पर्वत-जनपद-जाति-धर्म-युग-उपनदीभिः सह ) पृ॥४७॥११-४७

—हरिवर्षम् पृ॥४७॥१०-११

## समुद्रः

—सप्तसमुद्राः ( सप्तद्वीपानुगताः ) पृ॥४५॥४

—द्वीप-समुद्रसंबन्धः पृ॥४५॥५-६

## सरः

—जम्बूद्वीपीयानि—द्र० जम्बूद्वीपः पृ॥४५॥६-४८॥६२

—मेरुस्थानि पृ॥४५॥२३-२४

## ज्योतिषम् [ भुवनकोशीयम् ]

—भूरादिसप्तलोकाः, सप्तवायवः, सूर्यचन्द्रादिग्रहाः, नक्षत्राणि,  
ध्रुवः इत्येतेषां सामान्यं विवरणम् पृ॥४१॥१-४५

—सूर्यः पृ॥४२॥१-४३॥२८

—सोमादिग्रहाः पृ॥४३॥२९-४६

—महारादिलोकाः पृ॥४४॥१-१५

—पातालानि पृ॥४४॥१५-२५

—नरकाः पृ॥४४॥२५-२६

—पातालाद्यःस्थः शेषः पृ॥४४॥२६-२९

## तृतीयःखण्डः—शास्त्राणि विद्याः कलाश्च ( दर्शनवर्जितानि )

### शास्त्र-विद्या-कलासामान्यम्

सदसत् शास्त्रं, वेदपुराणादिभिः धर्मव्यवस्थापनम् पृ॥१२॥२९४-२९२

नाना-शास्त्र-प्रवचनम्, द्वापरयुगीनम् ( वेद शास्त्रेतिहासपुराणादीनाम् ) पृ॥२६॥४२-४७

वेदवाङ्मयशास्त्राणि मोहनार्थं प्रणीतानि ( आर्हत-कपाल-काल-पाञ्चरात्र-  
पाशुपत-पूर्वपश्चिम-भैरव-यामल-लाकुल-वाम-सोमाः ) { द्र० चतुर्थः  
खण्डः

चतुर्दशविद्यास्थानानि [ द्र० पाठान्तरम् ; इयं गणनाऽपूर्णार्थः ] पृ॥१२॥२७०-२७१

शास्त्र-विद्या-कलाविशेषाः—

## उपपुराणम्

—उपपुराणनामानि

पृ॥११६-२०

—व्यासशिष्यकनृकोपपुराणकथनम्

पृ॥१२१२६९

ज्योतिषम् [भुवनकोशीयज्योतिषम् भुवनकोशे द्र०]

धर्मशास्त्रम् [द्र० स्मृतिः]

—मुनिभिः प्रणीतानि

पृ॥१२१२६६-६७

## पुराणसामान्यम्

—पुराणसंहिता (सूतं प्रत्येतत्संबद्धः प्रश्नः कृतो महर्षिभिः)

पृ॥११२

—पुराणलक्षणम् (सर्गादि-पञ्चलक्षणम्)

पृ॥११२

—पुराण-संख्या (अष्टादशपुराण-नामानि)

पृ॥११३-१५

—व्यासाद्यैः पुराणानि कथितानि

पृ॥१२१२६८

—पुराणवक्ता सूतः

पृ॥५२११५

—व्यासकृत-अष्टादशपुराणमेदाः

पृ॥५२११९

## पुराणविशेषाः

—कूर्मपुराणाऽऽरम्भः (सूतर्षिसंवादेन)

पृ॥११०८

—कूर्मपुराणविवरणम्

पृ॥१११-२६

—कूर्मप्रवचनम् (आदौ कूर्मरूपिणा विष्णुनेदं प्रोक्तं, ततश्च सूतेनेदं प्रोक्तमृषिभ्यः, इदं श्रद्धातप्यम्)

पृ॥११२६-१३१

—कूर्म (पूर्वार्द्ध) —फलश्रुतिः

पृ॥५३११-३४

—कूर्मपुराणविषयसूची

पृ॥४६१६७-११९

—कूर्मपुराण-माहात्म्यम्

उ॥४६१२०-१४०

—कूर्मपुराण-वक्तृ-श्रोतृ-परम्परा

उ॥४६१४०-१४६

—वायवीयोत्तरपुराणम्

पृ॥२५१४२-४३ (श्लोकयोर्मध्ये कोष्ठकान्तर्गतम्)

—सावर्णिकृतपुराणसंहिता

पृ॥२५१४१-४३

## योगशास्त्रम्

—याज्ञवल्क्यकृतयोगशास्त्रम्

पृ॥२५१४४

## वेदः

—वेदमहिमा, वेदविरुद्धशास्त्राणि, वेदोपबृंहणार्थं शास्त्राणि

पृ॥१२१२५४-२७४

—वेद-स्वरूपम् ( ब्रह्मसहजस्वरूप-नित्य-अनादि- निधन-दिव्य-वाक् )	पू० २१७-२९
—वेदशब्दपूर्विका सृष्टिः	पू० ७६७-६८
—वेदाविर्भावः ( छन्दःस्तोमसामादिभिः सह )	पू० ७५७-६०
—वेदविभागः, वेदप्रवचनं च ( द्वापरयुगीयः )	पू० २६४२-४६
—अष्टाविंशतिवेदव्यासकृत-वेदविभागः	पू० ५२१-११
—व्यास-कर्तृक-वेदविभागः, ( वेदमहिमा भगवन्महिमा च )	पू० ५२१२-२६
—स्मृतिस्वरूपं, वेदवाक्यस्मृतिश्च	पू० २३०-३२
—वेदावयवविशेषाणां सुपनिषदादीनां जपः	उ० २७३७-३८
—चतुर्वेदप्रोक्ताः श्लोकाः	उ० ३१११-१६

### स्मृतिः

—स्मृतिशास्त्रस्वरूपं, वेदवाक्यस्मृतयश्च	पू० २३०-३२
—स्वायम्भुवमनुकृत-धर्मशास्त्रम्	पू० २३७
—स्वायम्भुवमनुप्रणीत-धर्मशास्त्रं, सुनिभिः प्रणीतानि धर्मशास्त्राणि च [मनुमतविषये दशमः खण्डो द्र०]	पू० १२१२६५-२६७

### सात्वतम्

—सात्वत-प्रवर्तितं कुण्डगोलादिभिः श्रितं शास्त्रम् [ अत्र अष्टपाठाः सन्ति, पाठान्तराण्यपि द्र० ]	पू० २४३०-३२
---	-------------

### चतुर्थः खण्डः—दार्शनिकाः संप्रदायाः प्रमेयाश्च

अवतारः [ मत्स्यादयः अवतारा यथास्थानं द्र० ]

—विष्णोरवताराः मन्वन्तरेषु, (विष्णोः चतुर्धा स्थितिः महिमा च)	पू० ५११२६-५०
—व्यासावताराः (अष्टाविंशतिः, प्रतिद्वापरम्)	पू० ५२१-११
—महादेवावताराः शिवयोगिनश्च	पू० ५३१-२८

### आत्मा

—द्र० ज्ञानम् (सांख्ययोगीयम्, आत्म-पुरुष-प्रकृतिपरम्)	उ० २११-३१३
—आत्म-ज्ञानम्, शिवस्वरूपादिभिः सह	उ० ८१-१८
—ज्ञानं शिवरूपात्मकम्	उ० ६११-१०१७

### आर्हतम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रं, ताम्रसम्	पू० १२१२६१-२६३
-------------------------------	----------------

ईश्वरः = शिवः, द्र० ईश्वरगीता

## कर्म

- कर्मयोगः (निष्कामं कर्म, ब्रह्मार्पणात्मकं कर्म; ६० पृ३।२७) पृ३।१४-२७  
 —कर्मयोगः (ब्राह्मणसदाचारः उ।१२।१, व्यासगीतोक्तः सदाचारः  
 कर्मयोगः उ।११।१३९) उ।१२।१-३०।२६

## कापालम्

- मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम्, तामसम् पृ१२।२६१-२६३  
 —मोहनशास्त्रम् पृ१६।११८-११९

## कालः

- शक्तिस्त्वान्तर्गतः पृ१२।२-३९  
 —कालतत्त्वम् (ईश्वरादिभिः सह) उ।३३।१-२३

## कालः [ पाशुपतस्थाने पाठान्तरम्; कालमुख इति प्रतिभाति ]

- मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम् पृ१६।११८-११९

## ज्ञानम्

- त्रिमूर्ति ( = ब्रह्म-विष्णु-शिव ) स्वरूपम् पृ१०।७७-८६  
 —ज्ञानयोगः, भक्तियोगादिभिः सह पृ१२।२७३-३०१  
 —आत्म-ब्रह्म-स्वरूपं (विज्ञानं उ।२।१; सांख्यज्ञानम् उ।२।४१)  
 वेदान्तसारं उ।२।४१) उ।२।१-३।२३  
 —गुह्यं ज्ञानं शिवस्वरूपं च उ।८।१-१८  
 —शिवस्वरूपात्मकं ज्ञानम् [ईश्वरगीतायामन्यत्रापि क्वचिदस्ति] उ।६।१-१०।१७

## देवः

- प्रतिजातिदेवनिर्णयः पृ२२।४०-४७  
 —जम्बूलक्षादिसप्तद्वीपपूजिता देवाः ६० तत्तद्द्वीपविवरणम्  
 द्वितीये खण्डे

## देवी

- शक्तितत्त्वं मायाशक्तिश्च (शक्तिरपि ६०) पृ१२।१९-३९

## धर्मः

- यज्ञवेदमहिमा, श्रुतिस्मृतिप्रतिपादितो धर्मः; धर्मशास्त्रं,  
 तद्व्यवस्थाश्च, धर्मानुष्ठानफलं च पृ२।२६-७४  
 —धर्मशास्त्रम्, वैदिकधर्मः सदसच्छास्त्रं च पृ१२।२६०-२७४  
 —श्रौतस्मार्तधर्मौ, धर्मशास्त्रश्च उ।२४।१४-२१  
 —जम्बूलक्षादिसप्तद्वीपगता धर्माः ६०-तत्तद्द्वीपविवरणम्  
 द्वितीये खण्डे

नरकः

—पातालाश्वत्थः ; पापिनां स्थानम्

पू० ४४।२५-२६

नाकुलम् = लाकुलं द्र०

पाञ्चरात्रम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम् [ सैरवस्थाने पाठा० ]

पू० १२।२६१-२६३

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम्

पू० १६।११८-११९

पाशुपतम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रं, वेदबाह्यशास्त्रम्

उ० ३९।६२

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम् [ अत्र पाठान्तरं कालः ]

पू० १६।११८-११९

—पाशुपतयोगव्रतम्, उपमन्युना प्रदत्तं कृष्णाय

पू० २५।४७

—पाशुपतयोगः [ ब्र० ६७ श्लोकः ] ( अत्र अष्टाङ्गयोगविवरणम् ;  
अभावयोग-ब्रह्मयोगादयः शब्दाः व्यवहृताः, अभ्यासान्ते  
एतज्ज्ञानपरम्परादिविषयाः )

उ० ११।१-१४७

—पाशुपतानां काशीस्थानां वर्णनम्

पू० ३४।५-७

पुरुषार्थः

—धर्मार्थकाममोक्षफलम्

पू० २।५३-६१

पूर्वपश्चिमम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम्

पू० १६।११८-११९

[ भट्टोजिदीक्षितेन तन्त्राधिकारिनिर्णये ( पृ० २८ ) अयमेव  
पाठ उद्धृतः ]

ब्रह्म

—ब्रह्मयोगः ; ब्र० पाशुपतयोगः

उ० ११।१-१४७

—ब्रह्मस्वरूपम्, शिवादिस्वरूपं च

पू० २।९०-९८

ब्रह्मा [ ब्र० सृष्टिप्रकरणं, शिवः विष्णुश्च ]

—ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपम् तन्नामनिर्वचनं च

पू० ४।३७-६५

भक्तिः

—कलियुगीय-पापोद्धारार्थं शिवोपासना

पू० ३०।३८-५५

—भक्तियोगः ज्ञानयोगश्च

पू० १२।२७५-३०१

भैरवम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम्

पू० १६।११८-११९

July, 1961]

कर्मपुराण-विषयसूची

363

—वेदबाह्यशास्त्रम्

पू॥१२॥२६१-२६३

— ”

उ॥३९॥६२

माहेश्वर-धर्मः

उ॥४४॥७-८

यामलम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रं, तामसम्

पू॥१२॥२६१-२६३

योगः

—अष्टाङ्गयोगः, योगसाधनानि च ( ब्रह्मयोगः—उ॥११॥८,

अथं पाञ्चपतयोगः उ॥११॥६७ )

उ॥११॥१-१४७

—सबीजो योगः, अत्र शिवमहिमा प्रतिपादितः

उ॥४६॥२१-५३

—पाञ्चपतयोगः सांख्ययोगौ शिवस्वरूपादिश्च

उ॥३९॥४३-६५

लाकुलम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम् [ नाकुल इति पाठा० ]

पू॥१६॥११८-११९

—वेदविरुद्धं मोहनं शास्त्रम्

उ॥३६॥६२

वामम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम्

पू॥१६॥११८-११९

—वेदबाह्य-शास्त्रम्

उ॥३६॥६२

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रं, तामसम्

उ॥१२॥२६१-२६३

विष्णुः

—विष्णुस्वरूपम्, शिवादीनामैक्यम्

पू॥२॥९०-९८

—विष्णोश्चतुर्धा स्थितिः, महिमा, मन्वन्तरीया विष्णोरवताराः

पू॥११॥२६-५०

—विष्णुतत्त्वम्

पू॥१७॥३२-३८

—विष्णुविषया भावना विष्णुतत्त्वं च

पू॥१८८-९७

वेदान्तः

—आत्माविज्ञानं ( उ॥२॥४१ सर्ववेदान्त-सारम् )

उ॥२॥१-३॥२३

वैखानसः

—वानप्रस्थस्य एतन्मत्तानुसारेणावस्थानम्

उ॥२७॥२७

शक्तिः

—शिवशक्तिः

उ॥४॥१-३४

—शक्तिरूपम् ( शिवशक्तिः मायाशक्तिश्च )

पू॥१२॥२-३९

शिवः

—विष्णुब्रह्मशिवैक्यम्, रुद्राश्रिता त्रिभावना, शिवार्चनम्	पू२।९०-१११
—शिवमहिमा	उ।४।१-३४
—लिङ्गार्चनं लिङ्गस्वरूपं, ब्रह्मविष्णु प्रति शिववरदानं च	पू२६।५५-११०
—शिवस्वरूपम्, ब्रह्मादिस्वरूपं च	उ।५।१-४६
—शिवस्य विश्वरूपत्वम्, महिमा च	उ।६।१-१०।१७
—कलियुगे लिङ्गार्चनम्, शिवमहिमा, शिवावतारः	पू३०।३२-५५
—शिवस्य माहात्म्यम्	उ।६।१-५३
—शिवस्य प्रभावः ( केषु किंरूपेण शिवः )	उ।७।१-८।१८
—शैवयोगिनामानि महादेवावतारश्च	पू।५।३।१-२८
—शिवमहिमा	पू।१५।८१-९३
—प्राकृतल्यकारिणः शिवस्य महिमा तस्य सर्वदेवात्मकत्वम् ; संबद्धविषयैः सह	उ।४६।२१-५३
—पाशुपतयोगः, सांख्ययोगश्च, शिवस्वरूपं शैवशास्त्राणि च	उ।३६।४३-६५
—शिवमहिमा, शिवस्वरूपं च	उ।३५।६२-७५

श्रीः

—श्री ( नारायणपत्नी ) स्वरूपम्	पू।१।३४-४०
--------------------------------	------------

सात्वतम्

—सात्वतप्रवर्तितं शास्त्रम्	पू२४।३०-३२
-----------------------------	------------

सांख्यम्

—सांख्यज्ञानविवरणम्, आत्मप्रकृतिपुरुषादीनि तत्त्वानि (सांख्ययोग- समाश्रयम् उ।२।५६ ; सांख्यज्ञानम्—उ।२।४१ )	उ।२।१-३।२३
—सांख्ययोगपाशुपतियोगाः शिवस्वरूपं-शैवशास्त्राणि च	उ।३६।४३-६५

सौम्यम्

—मोहनार्थं शास्त्रम्	उ।३६।६२
----------------------	---------

### पञ्चमः खण्डः—आचारः कर्मकाण्डश्च

आशौचम् [द्र० श्राद्धमपि]

उ।२३।१-८३

आश्रमः

—आश्रमधर्मः ( चतुराश्रमधर्माः, गार्हस्थ्यश्रेष्ठता, धर्ममहिमा च )	पू२।४१-७४
--	-----------



—प्रत्याश्रममेकमेदाः	पू२।७४-८८
—आश्रमक्रमश्चातुराश्रम्यधर्मश्च	पू३।१-२८
—ब्रह्मचर्यम् ( ब्राह्मणानाम् )	उ।१२।१-१४।९१
—गार्हस्थ्यम् ( द्विजातीनाम् उ।२५।१ ; उ।१५।४२ धर्माध्यायः; भक्ष्याभक्ष्यस्नानसन्ध्यादि नित्यकर्मश्राद्धाशौचादयः )	उ।१५।१-२४।२१
—द्विजातिवृत्तिः, गृहस्थानां दानधर्मश्च	उ।२५।१-२६।७८
—वानप्रस्थम्	उ।२७।१-३९
—संन्यासः ( ब्रह्माश्रमः उ।२८।४ ; यतिः उ।२९।१ )	उ।२८।१-२९।४७
<b>तपः</b>	
—दानप्रस्थान्तर्गतम्	उ।२७।१-३९
<b>दानम्</b>	
—दानधर्मः ( गृहस्थविविधप्रसंगतः—उ।२६।७५ )	उ।२६।१-७८
<b>धर्मः</b>	
—चतुराश्रमधर्मः, धर्मशास्त्रम्, आश्रममेदाः	पू२।६७-१११
<b>पापाचरणम्—</b> द० प्रायश्चित्तम्	उ।३०।१-३४।१४३
<b>पूजा</b>	
—लिङ्गाचनमहिमा, लिङ्गस्वरूपम्	पू।२६।५५-६४
<b>प्रायश्चित्तम्</b>	
—प्रायश्चित्तविधिः विप्राणां ; ( कपालमोचनतीर्थप्रसंगतः )	उ।३०।१-३४।१४७
<b>मन्त्रः</b>	
—नित्यकर्मसु श्राद्धादिषु च मन्त्राः	उ।१८।१-२४।२१
<b>यज्ञः</b>	
—यज्ञप्रवर्तनं त्रेतायाम्	पू।२९।४१-४२
—यज्ञनिष्पत्तये वर्णसृष्टिः	पू।२।२५-२६
—वानप्रस्थाश्रमासुष्ठेया यज्ञाः, संबद्धविषयैः सह	उ।२७।१-३९
—अग्निहोत्रादिः ( ब्राह्मणानाम् )	उ।२४।१-२१
<b>वर्णः</b>	
—वर्णोत्पत्तिः ( ब्रह्मसुखतः )	पू।२।२५-२७
—ब्राह्मणधर्मः ( कर्मयोगनामकः सदाचार-विवरणात्मकः )	उ।१२।१-२४।२१

—द्विजातिवृत्तिः [ अत्र द्विजातिपदेन ब्राह्मणः ]	उ।२५।१-२१
—स्वायम्भुवमन्वन्तुसारेण भृशवादिभिः कथितः वर्षधर्मः	पू।२।३६-४१
—लक्षादिद्वीपगतवर्णः	इ० तत्तद्वर्णविवरणम् द्वितीये खण्डे

श्राद्धः

—श्राद्धकल्पः ( गृहस्थानाम् आशौचविधिश्च )	उ।२०।१-२३।८३
---	--------------

सदाचार-सामान्यम्

—पतिव्रतामाहात्म्यम्	उ।३४।११०-१४१
—धर्मः	पू।२।३७-१११
—गृहस्थ-सदाचारः	उ।१५।१-२४।२१
—त्रिपुण्ड्र-तिलकधारणम्	पू।२।१०६-१०८

षष्ठः खण्डः—कालः ( कालावयव-युग-मन्वन्तर-कल्पाः )

(१) विभागः—कालकालावयवौ

कालः

—निमेषकाष्ठादिकालावयवः	पू।५।१-२६
------------------------	-----------

(२) विभागः—युगम्

युगधर्मः

—चतुर्युगस्वभाववैशिष्ट्यम्	पू।२३।८-१४
—कृतयुगीयः	पू।२६।१४-२१
—त्रैतायुगीयः	पू।२६।२२-४२
—द्वापरयुगीयः	पू।२६।४२-५१
—कलि ( तिष्य ) युगीयः पू।३०।४२-६९ कलिदोषनाशार्थं शिवशरणागत्यादयो विषयाः	पू।३०।१-४१
—घोरे कलियुगे विष्णुभक्तानां कर्तव्यम्	पू।२७।८-१८

(३) विभागः—मन्वन्तरम्

मन्वन्तरसामान्यम्

—षडतीतमन्वानामानि, सप्तम-मनुप्रवर्तनम्	पू।५।११-६
प्रियव्रतान्विताः	पू।५।११९-२०
खण्डवताराः, विष्णु-महिमा च	पू।५।१२६-५०

मन्वन्तरविशेषाः

स्वायम्भुवम् ( इदं कल्पादौ कथितम्, स्वायम्भुवमनुपुत्रप्रियव्रतवंशश्च

पू॥४०॥१-४८ ; १, ९ खण्डे ॥३०)

पू॥५१॥६

स्वरोचिषम् ( मन्वन्तरीयदेव-ऋषि-मनुपुत्रैः सह )

पू॥५१॥६-९

उत्तमम् "

पू॥५१॥१०-१२

तामसम् "

पू॥५१॥१३-१५

रैवतम् "

पू॥५१॥१६-१९

चाक्षुषम् "

पू॥५१॥२०-२३

वैवस्वतम् "

पू॥५१॥२३-२६

सावर्णादिमनवः ( संक्षेपतः )

पू॥५३॥२९-३१

## (४) विभागः कल्पः

कल्पमानम् ( वाराहकल्पः सारिकादिकल्पप्रकारश्च )

उ॥४५॥४९-५३

कल्पपरिमाणः ब्रह्मवत्सरः, परार्धं च

पू॥५१॥७-१९

षड्वाराहकल्पौ

पू॥५२॥५-२६

**सप्तमः खण्डः—संवाद-स्तुति-नीति-गाथा-उपदेशादयः**

## (१) विभागः—संवादः [ वक्तृनामक्रमानुसारतः ]

मार्कण्डेय-युधिष्ठिरकृतः

—प्रयागमाहात्म्यविषयकः, पू॥३९॥१८ पर्यन्तमिदं प्रकरणम् पू॥३६॥३-४

—नर्मदासाहात्म्यविषयकः, प्रकरणमिदं उ॥४२॥४२ पर्यन्तव्यापि उ॥४०॥१-२

व्यास-ऋषिकृतः

—ईश्वरगीताविषयकः, इयं गीता उ॥११॥१४७ पर्यन्तम् उ॥११॥५१

—ब्राह्मणसदाचार धर्मविषयकः, इयं व्यासगीता उ॥३४॥१५२ पर्यन्तम् उ॥१२॥१-२

व्यास-अर्जुनकृतः

—युगधर्मविषयकः पू॥३०॥६३ पर्यन्तम् पू॥२८॥१-७

व्यास-जैमिनिकृतः

—वाराणसीमाहात्म्यविषयकः, पू॥३५॥३३ पर्यन्तमस्ति, पू॥३१॥६-१२

शिव-सनत्कुमारकृतः

—ईश्वरगीतायाः मूलभूतः संवाद इति व्यासेनोक्तम्

उ॥११-१५

शिव-देवीकृतः

—वाराणसीमाहात्म्यं पृ॥३१॥२१ तः अधिकृतम्

पृ॥३११६-२०

सूत (रोमहर्षण)-ऋषि (नैमिषेय) कृतः

—कूर्मपुराणविषयकः, एतदनन्तरं कथारम्भः

पृ॥११२-८

## (२) विभागः--स्तुति-स्तव-स्तोत्रादीनि च

[ पूजान्तर्गतस्तुतिवन्मन्त्रा नेह संकलिताः ]

स्तुत्यः	स्तोता	
अग्निः	सीता	उ॥३४॥११७-१२३
		[ वङ्गयष्टकम् ]
देवी	हिमवान्	पृ॥१२०७.३४८
"	अन्धकः	पृ॥१६॥२१६-३८
ब्रह्मा	बसुमनाः	पृ॥२०॥५३-५५
भैरवः [शिवः]	अन्तरिक्षचराः	पृ॥१६॥१८७-१८९
बराहः	ऋषयः	पृ॥६॥११-३१
विष्णुः	आदित्याः	पृ॥१७॥१९-२३
"	इन्द्रद्युम्नः	पृ॥१६॥१-८९
„कूर्मरूपी	मुनयः	उ॥४६॥५४-६३
शिवः	अन्धकः	पृ॥१६॥१९४-२०३
"	कृष्णः	पृ॥२६॥१०२-१०३
		[ स्तुतिवत् नमस्कारात्मकम् ]
"	कृष्णः	पृ॥२५॥६०-२६
"	मुनयः	उ॥३९॥२१-३५
	ब्रह्मा	पृ॥१०॥४४-४३

स्तुत्यः	स्तोता	
शिवः	ब्रह्मा	उ३११४९-५६
"		[ सोमाष्टकं, उ३११५७ ]
"	ब्रह्मविष्णु	पू२६१७८-८४
"	x	पू२६११०३-१०६
"		[ नमस्कारात्मकम् ]
"	मुनयः	उ ११३३-३५
"	मुनयः	उ१५१२१-४०
"	वसुमनाः	पू२०१६६
"		[ नमस्कारात्मकम् ]
"	व्यासः	पू३०१४४-५२
"		[ नमस्कारात्मकम् ]
"	शङ्कुकर्णः	पू३३१३६-४५
"	धेतः	उ३६१२९-३२
सरस्वती	नवरथनृपः	पू२४११७-२०
सूर्यः	ब्रह्मप्रदर्शितः	उ१८१३५-४४
		[ सूर्यहृदयस्तवः ]

### (३) विभागः—मङ्गलान्वरणम्

कूर्म ( विष्णु )—प्रति पुराणारम्भे	पू१११
कूर्मरूपिनारायणं व्यासं च प्रति ( कूर्मपुराणान्ते )	उ१४६११४६-१४७
विष्णुपरकं नमस्कारात्मकम् ( पूर्वाश्रान्ते )	पू५३१३४

### (४) विभागः—विशिष्टाः उपदेशनीतिगीतादयः

#### उपदेशः

#### देवीकृतः

—हिमवते, शास्त्रप्राप्त्यभक्तिज्ञानयोगविषयकः,	पू१२१२४७-३०१
गुह्योपदेशः, पू१२१३०२	

#### भगवत्कृतः

—इन्द्रयुग्माय, जगन्मायासयत्व-भगवद्-भावनाविषयकः	पू११८६-९५
---	-----------

## गीता

ईश्वरगीता शिव (=ईश्वर)-कृता

—इदं ज्ञानमादौ शिवेन सनत्कुमारादिभ्यः भाषितं, उ११-५१  
तदेव व्यासेन मुनिभ्यः कथितम्, इयं गीता उ१११४७  
पर्यन्तमस्ति

व्यासगीता व्यासकृता

—ब्राह्मणानां कर्मयोगः, वर्णाश्रमधर्मः, इयं गीता उ१२१  
उ१३४१५२ पर्यन्तमस्ति; आदौ मनु-ऋषि-संवादे इयमासीत्

## (५) विभागः—गाथा

—पि नृगाथा—( गयाश्राद्धविषयकः ) उ२०१२९-३१  
,, ( गयाश्राद्धविषयकः ) उ३५१११-१३

## (६) विभागः—नामानि (शतसहस्रनामादीनि)

देवीनामानि

( १००८ संख्यकानि ) पू१२१६२-१९९

## अष्टमः खण्डः—वंश-वंशानुचरिते

विभागः—वंशः [राजवंश एव; शब्दतः अर्थतो वा वंशत्वेन प्रतिज्ञाता  
वंशा एवात्र संकलिताः]

राजवंशः [सूर्यसोमवंशात्मकः <sup>१</sup> ऋ० पू१६१२८]	पू२०११-२७१२२
—आनकदुन्दुमिवंशः	पू२४१५१
—इक्ष्वाकुवंशः	पू२०११०-२११६१
—क्रोष्टुवंश [ऋ० पू२३१२७]	पू२४११
—यदुवंशः (कृष्णपर्यन्तः)	पू२२११२-२४१८६
—वृषवंशः	पू२३१३
—सहस्रजिद्वंशः	पू२२११२-२३१२७

(१) अत्र सूर्यसोमवंशारम्भे वंशपदं न प्रयुक्तमस्ति । क्वचिद् वंशपदं वंशान्ते प्रयुज्यते, यथा इक्ष्वाकुवंश-विषये वंशान्ते वंशपदम् ( पू२११६१ ) । पुष्पिकायामपि क्वचिद् वंशपदं दृश्यते, यथा यदुवंश सोमवंश-निर्देशौ पुष्पिकायामेव । यत्र वंशारयान्तो न स्पष्टमभिहितः, तत्र आरम्भ एव सूच्यां दर्शितः ।

## विभागः—वंशानुचरितम् [राजवंशान्तर्गत-विशिष्टचरितानि]

अक्रूरः

—श्वफल्कपुत्रः, देववानित्यादयोऽस्य पुत्राः

पू२४।४३-४५

अत्रिः

—ऋषिः, वसुमनसं नृपं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयः-संवन्धिकथनम्

पू२०।२९-४०

अदितिः

—कश्यपभार्या, अदितेः आदित्यजन्म, तस्य भार्या-चतुष्टयम्

पू२०।१-२

अन्धकः

—अंशुपुत्रः, विष्णुभक्तः, नारदवचनात् सात्वतं नाम शास्त्रं  
प्रवर्त्तयामास

पू२४।३०-३२

अनिरुद्धः

—प्रद्युम्नपुत्रः, बाणविजेता

पू२७।२-४

अनुः

—ययाति-शर्मिष्ठापुत्रः, उत्तरदिशि अस्य राज्यम्

पू२२।५-११

असमञ्जसः

—सगर-भानुमतीपुत्रः, अंशुमान् अस्य पुत्रः

पू२१।४-६

आदित्यः [=सूर्यः]

—कश्यपादितिपुत्रः, अस्य पत्न्यः संज्ञा-राज्ञी-प्रभा-छायाः ;  
अस्य मनुयमादयः पुत्राश्च

पू२०।१-४

आनकदुन्दुभिः

—तमःपुत्रः, गोवर्द्धनपर्वते ब्रह्मण आराधनम्, वंशवृक्षयर्थं  
वरप्राप्तिः, गानविद्यया शिवस्यानुरञ्जनं, शिवात्कन्यारत्न-  
प्राप्तिः, अस्यापत्यानि

पू२४।४९-५७

आयुः

—पुरुवरसः पुत्रः, स्वर्भातुतनया प्रभाऽस्य पत्नी, अस्य पञ्च पुत्राः

पू२२।१-३

आहुकः

—पुनर्वसुपुत्रः अस्य पुत्र उग्रदेनः

पू२४।६२-६३

इक्ष्वाकुः

—मनुपुत्रः, अस्य ज्येष्ठपुत्रो विकुक्षिः, इक्ष्वाकुवंश-  
वर्णनम् पू२०।६० पर्यन्तम्

पू२०।१०-११

इला

—मनोः पुत्री, सोमवंशविवर्धिनी, इलाया उत्कल-गय-  
विनतनामानः पुत्राः

पू२०।४-१०

उग्रसेनः

—आहुकपुत्रः, कंसादयोऽस्य पुत्राः

पू२४।६३-६७

उर्वशी

—अप्सराः, ३० दुर्जयः

पू२३।४-४४

उपमन्युः

—मुनिः; अस्याश्रमे कृष्णस्य तपश्चरणम्; उपमन्यु-आश्रम-सहिमा,  
अनेन कृष्णं प्रति पाशुपतयोगोपदेशः कृतः, कृष्णं प्रति शिवस्य  
वरदानम्

पू२५।१-१२

कंसः

—उग्रसेनपुत्रः;

पू२४।६६-६७

—सुषेणादयः वसुदेवपुत्राः अनेन हताः

पू२४।७५-७६

ककुत्स्थः

—विकुक्षेरयं ज्येष्ठः पुत्रः

पू२०।१०-११

कण्वः

—ऋषिः ३० दुर्जयः

पू२३।४४-४

कश्यपः

—कश्यपभार्या अदितिः, अस्मादादित्यजन्म, आदित्यस्य  
भार्याचतुष्टयम्;

पू२०।१-२

—वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंबन्धिकथनम्

पू२०।२९-४३

कार्तवीर्यः

—अन्यकपुत्रः सहस्रबाहुः, जामदग्न्यरामेण संयुगे हतः, अस्य  
भक्तपुत्राः, तेषु मुख्याः सूर-शूरसेन-कृष्ण-धृष्ण-जयध्वज-  
नामानः, कार्तवीर्यपुत्राणां शिव-विष्णुभक्ति-विषयकः  
संशयः, वसिष्ठादिसप्तर्षिभिः मार्गनिर्देशः कृतः, सर्वेषां  
पुत्राणां राज्यशासनम्

पू२२।१८-५०

कुनलयाश्वः

—शुद्धसपुत्रः, धुन्धुहननात् धुन्धुमारनामप्राप्तिः

पू२०।२०-२१



कुराः

—रामपुत्रः, अतिथिरस्य पुत्रः

पृ२१।५५-५६

कृष्णः

—रुद्रभक्तः, कार्तवीर्यपुत्रः ; द्व० कार्तवीर्यः

पृ२२।१८-८७

कृष्णः

—वसुदेव-देवकीपुत्रः, भृगुशापाद् देवकीगर्भे आगमनम्, पुत्रार्थं तपः, उपमन्युनास्मै शैवं ज्ञानं प्रदत्तं कृष्णस्य शिवदेवीभ्यां वरप्राप्तिः, कृष्णपरन्त्यः, साम्प्रत्युन्नादयः पुत्राश्च, अस्य परपद-प्राप्तिश्च ; द्व० शिवोऽपि

पृ२४।७०-२७।२०

कैकेयी

—इशरथपत्नी, पत्युः वरयाचनं, तदनुसारेण रामो वनं गतवान्

पृ२१।२६-३१

कौशल्या

—सात्वतपत्नी, अन्नकादयोऽस्याः पुत्राः, ज्येष्ठो भजमानो धनुर्वेदवित्

पृ२४।३४-३५

कौशिकी

—उमासंभूता, अशोदातनयारूपेण जाता

पृ२४।७४

क्रतुः

—वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसम्बन्धिकथनम्

पृ२०।२९-४४

गन्धर्वः [नाम नास्ति]

—द्व० दुर्जयः

पृ२३।४-४७

गरुडः [=सुपर्णः]

—अनेन कृष्णे अनुपस्थिते सति द्वारका रक्षिता

पृ२६।१९-२२

गौतमः

—विप्रः, तपस्वी, युवनार्यं प्रति पुत्रप्राप्तये

उपदेश-दानम्

पृ२०।१२-१८

—ऋषिः, वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंबन्धिकथनम्

पृ२०।२९-४२

छाया

—सूर्यपत्नी, सावर्णिमनुशानितपतीविष्टिगामानः अस्याः पुत्राः

पृ२०।१-४

जनकः

—जनेन सन्तोषिता पार्वती सीतामस्मै ददौ, शिवेनास्मै अनुदत्तम् पृ॥२१॥२०-२१

जमदग्निः

—ऋषिः, वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंवन्धिकथनम् पृ॥२०॥२९-३८

जयध्वजः

—कार्तवीर्यार्जुनपुत्रः, विष्णुभक्तः, रुद्रभक्तैः भ्रातृभिः सह विष्णु-  
श्रैष्ठ्यविषये विवादः, सप्तर्षिकर्तृकोऽत्र निर्णयः, विदेहेन सहस्य  
युद्धम्, विदेहपराजयश्च, जयध्वजं द्रष्टुं दिश्वामित्रस्यागमनं,  
दिश्वामित्रेण विष्णुमहिमा प्रोक्तो जयध्वजाय, दिश्वामित्र एनं  
याजयामास च पृ॥२२॥१९-८७

जाम्बवती

—कृष्णपत्नी, साम्बोऽस्याः पुत्रः; ३० कृष्णश्च पृ॥२॥१

तुर्वसुः

—ययाति-देवयानी-पुत्रः, दक्षिणपूर्वदिशि अस्य राज्यम् पृ॥२२॥६-९

त्रसदस्युः

—पुरुकुत्सपुत्रः, नर्मदोत्पन्नः पृ॥२०॥२७-२८

त्रिधन्वा

—वसुमनसः पुत्रः, ३० वसुमनाः पृ॥२०॥३०

दशरथः

—भजपुत्रः, रामादयोऽस्य पुत्राः; ३० रामः पृ॥२१॥१६-१७

दुर्जयः

—कालिन्दीतटे उर्वश्या सह संभोगः, ततश्च स्वगृहे आगमनम्,  
संभोगजन्यपापमयात् कण्वकृषेराश्रमं प्रति प्रायश्चित्तार्थमा-  
गमनम्, मार्गे मालां नीत्वा गच्छन्तमेकं गन्धर्वं विक्षित्य  
द्वेभकृट्माजगाम, ततश्च मानससरस्तीरे भ्रमन्तीमुर्वशीं मालया-  
ञ्जलचकार, तथा सह रेमे, ततश्च तपश्चकार, कण्वाय सर्वं  
निवेदितवान् च, कण्वोपदेशतो वाराणस्यामागमनं, शिवदर्शनेन  
राजा पापमुक्तो बभूव ।

पृ॥२३॥४-४४

## देवकः

—आहुकपुत्रः, अस्य देववद्-उपदेव-सुदेव-देवरक्षित-नामानः  
पुत्राः, सप्त कन्याश्च

पू२४।६३-६६

## देवकी

—देवककन्या वसुदेवपत्नी ; द्र० वसुदेवोऽपि

पू२४।६३-६६

## देवयानी

—उशनसः पुत्री, ययातिपत्नी, यदुतुर्वं पू अस्याः पुत्री

पू२२।६-११

## देवावृधः

—सात्वतपुत्रः, तपस्यानन्तरं बभ्रुनामानं पुत्रमवाप

पू२४।३४-३६

## देवी [शिवपत्नीत्वेन प्रसिद्धा]

—शिवतः कृष्णस्य वरप्राप्तिः, नारायण एव कृष्णरूपेण देवकीगर्भे  
संजात इति देव्या उक्तम्, कृष्णाय वरो दत्तो देव्या

पू२५।८३-९२

## दुष्टुः

—ययातिशर्मिष्ठापुत्रः, प्रतीच्यां दिशि ब्रह्मराज्यम्

पू२२।६-१०

## धुन्धुमारः

—अयमेव कुचलयाश्वः, अस्य त्रयः पुत्राः

पू२०।२०-२१

## धृष्णः

—कार्तवीर्यपुत्रः, रुद्रभक्तः ; द्र० कार्तवीर्यः

पू२२।१८-८७

## नकुलः

—अश्वक-उत्कला-पुत्रः, परशुरामभयाद् नारीकवचधारणम्,  
वने गमनं च

पू२१।१३-१४

## नवरथः

—वृष्णिपुत्रः, मृगयां गतः राक्षसं दृष्ट्वा भीतः सन् दुद्राव, सरस्वतीं  
स्तुतवान् च, सरस्वत्या राक्षसी हतः, स्वपुरमागत्य राज्ञा  
देवीपूजनं कृतम्

पू२४।११-२६

## नर्मदा

—पुरुकुलपत्नी, अस्याः पुत्रः प्रसवस्त्रुः

पू२०।२७-२८

## नहुषः

—आयुषः पुत्रः, पितृकन्या विरजाभ्यः पत्नी ; यत्यादयः  
पञ्चास्य पुत्राः

पू२२।३-५

## नारदः

- नारदवचनादन्धकेन सात्वततन्त्रं प्रणीतम् पृ२४।३१-३२  
 —नारदं प्रति द्वारवतीवासिनां कृष्णः क्वेति प्रश्नः, कैलास-  
 शिखरेऽधुना कृष्णस्तिष्ठतीति नारदेनोक्तम् पृ२६।२३-२५

## पुरूरवाः

- सोमपुत्रबुधसंगता इला पुरूरवसमसूत पृ२०।६-८  
 —इलापुत्रः, अस्य षट् पुत्राः पृ२२।१-२

## पुलस्त्यः

- ऋषिः, वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंबन्धिकथनम् पृ२०।२९-३६

## पुलहः

- ऋषिः, वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंबन्धिकथनम् पृ२०।२९-३७

## पुरुः

- मयातिशर्मिष्ठापुत्रः, ययातिनायं राज्येऽभिषिक्तः, अस्य भ्रातरः  
 यदु-सुवसु दुह्यु-अनवः पृ२२।३-९

## प्रद्युम्नः

- कृष्णपुत्रः, कृष्णसदृशः, अस्य पुत्रोऽनिरुद्धः पृ२७।२

## प्रभा

- सूर्यपत्नी, प्रभातोऽस्याः पुत्रः पृ२०।२-३

## प्रभा

- सगरपत्नी, अग्न्याराधनानन्तरं षष्टिसहस्रपुत्रप्राप्तिः पृ२१।४-६

## प्रभा

- स्वर्भाबुतनया, आयुषः पत्नी, अस्या नहुषादयः पञ्च पुत्राः पृ२२।३-४

## वसुः

- देवावृषपुत्रः, पितृतपोऽनन्तरमयं जातः पृ२४।३६-६७

## वाणः

- अनिरुद्धेनायं विजितः पृ२७।२-४

## वुषः

- सोमपुत्रः, अनेन सह संगता इला पुरूरवसमसूत पृ२०।६-८

## ब्रह्मा

—राज्ञः वसुमनसः हिमालये तपश्चरणं, ब्रह्मण आगमनं, तस्माद्  
राज्ञा आयुः प्रार्थितम्, पुनस्तपश्चरणं, राज्ञा शिवो दृष्टः,  
शिवो राज्ञे आयुर्दत्तवान्, राज्ञः परमेष्ठिस्थानप्राप्तिश्चान्ते । पृ० २०१५१-७६

—कृष्णसमीपे मार्कण्डेयागमनं, मया लोकहिताय लिङ्गपूजनं  
क्रियत इति कृष्णेनोक्तम्, शिवतत्त्वं लिङ्गतत्त्वं च कथितं  
कृष्णेन; एकार्णवावस्थायां ब्रह्मविष्णुविवादः, शिवलिङ्गाविर्भावः,  
शिवलिङ्गस्य ऊर्वाधःप्रदेशज्ञानाय ब्रह्म-विष्णुयतितवस्तौ,  
तदज्ञात्वा उभयोरपि शिवसमीप आगमनं, उभाभ्यां शिवस्तुतिः  
कृता, आभ्यां शिवेन वरो दत्तः । पृ० २६१६६-११०

## भगीरथः

—दिलीपपुत्रः, गङ्गानेनावतारिता पृ० २१७-९

## भजमानः

—साहवतर्कशल्यापुत्रः, धनुर्वेदवित् पृ० २४१३४-३५

## भरतः

—दशरथपुत्रः, ६० रामः पृ० २११६-५४

## भरद्वाजः

—ऋषिः, वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंवन्धिकथनम् पृ० २०१२९-४०

## भानुमती

—सगरपत्नी, बह्निमाराध्यासमञ्जसनामकं पुत्रमवाप पृ० २१४-६

## मान्धाता

—धुवनाश्वपुत्रः, विष्णुभक्तः पृ० २०१३-२५

## मार्कण्डेयः

—ऋषिः, कृष्णेन सह शिवपूजनम् पृ० २६१४३-४५

## यदुः

—ययाति-देवयानीपुत्रः, दक्षिणापथस्य राजा, अस्य  
पञ्च पुत्राः पृ० २२१६-१३

## ययातिः

—नहुषपुत्रः, पराक्रमी, अस्य यष्टादयः पञ्च पुत्राः, पुत्रान्  
राज्येऽभिषिच्यार्यं तपश्चचार पृ० २२१५-११

युवनाश्वः

—आर्द्रकपुत्रः गोकर्णतीर्थे गौतमं प्रति पुत्रप्राप्तये प्रार्थना,  
पुत्रप्राप्तये विष्णुपासना कृताऽनेन

पू२०।१२-१८

युवनाश्वः

—रणाश्वपुत्रः, वारुणीष्टिकर्मणा मान्धातुनामकं पुत्रमवा ।

पू२०।२३-२५

राज्ञी

—सूर्यपत्नी, अस्या यम-यमुना-रेवन्तः पुत्राः

पू२०।१-३

रामः

—दशरथपुत्रः, भरतादयश्च भ्रातरः विष्णुशक्तिसमन्विताः,

शिवधनुर्भङ्गःकृतोऽनेन, ततश्च सीतया सह विवाहः, कैकेयीवचनान्तरा-  
रामस्य वनवासः, रावणकतृकसीताहरणम्, सुग्रीवेण हनूमता  
सह रामस्य सख्यं, सीतान्वेषणं हनूमता, सेतुनिर्माणपूर्वकं  
रामस्य रावणपुर्या लङ्कायां प्रवेशः, लिङ्गपूजा च, रामेण  
रावणे हतः, रामपुत्रौ कुशलबौ; रामवंशश्च (पू२१।५५-६०)

पू२१।१६-५६

रामः [=संकर्षणः]

—रोहिणीपुत्रः, शेषरूपः, अस्य भार्या रेवती, द्वौ पुत्रौ च; कृष्णभ्राता  
द्र० कृष्णोऽपि

पू२४।७१-७९

रावणः

—राक्षसः रामेणायं हतः; द्र० रामः

पू२१।१६-५६

रेवती

—वलरामपत्नी, अस्या द्वौ निधितोल्मुकनामानौ पुत्रौ

पू२४।७९

रोहिणी

—वसुदेवपत्नी, बलरामोऽस्याः पुत्रः

पू२४।७१-७८

लक्ष्मणः

—रामभ्राता, अनेन सह रामो वने तस्थौ, द्र० रामः

पू२१।१६-५६

लवः

—रामपुत्रः, सर्वतत्त्वार्थवित्

पू२१।५५-५६

वसिष्ठः

—ऋषिः, वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंबन्धिकथनम्

पू२०।२९-३५

## वसुदेवः

- देवकस्य सप्तकन्यानां पतिः, शूरसेनपुत्रः, कृष्णरामजनकः,  
देवकीरोहिण्यौ पत्न्यौ, अस्य सुषेणादयः पुत्राः कंसेन हताः पृ२४।६४-७८

## वसुमनाः

- हर्यश्वपुत्रः, ऋषिभ्यः श्रेयोमार्गोपदेशं धृत्वा त्रिधन्वनस्मिन् पुत्रे  
राजधुरं निक्षिप्य वने तप्तुं जगाम, ब्रह्मस्तुतिः, ब्रह्मतः आयुः  
प्रार्थना, शिवेनास्मै वरो दत्तः, शिवलोकप्राप्तिश्च पृ२०।२९-७६

## विकुक्षिः

- इक्ष्वाकुपुत्रः, अस्य पञ्चदश पुत्राः, तेषु ककुत्स्थो ज्येष्ठः पृ२०।१०-११

## विदेहः

- दानवः, अनेन सह जयध्वजादिकार्त्तवीर्यपुत्राणां युद्धं,  
जयध्वजकर्तृकविष्णुस्मरणम्, विष्णुचक्रेण विदेहस्कन्धच्छेदनम् पृ२२।५१-६७

## विरजा

- पितृकन्या, नहुषपत्नी, अस्या यस्यादयः पञ्च पुत्राः पृ२२।४-५

## विश्वामित्रः

- ऋषिः, वसुमनसं प्रत्यस्य श्रेयःसंबन्धिकथनम् पृ२०।२९-३९  
—विदेहदानववधानन्तरं जयध्वजमृपसमीपे अस्य आगमनम्,  
विष्णुमाहात्म्यकथनं च पृ२२।६७-८१

## विष्णुः

- ३० ब्रह्मा पृ२६।६६-११०

## वैवस्वतमनुः

- सूर्यपुत्रः, संज्ञास्य माता, अस्य नव पुत्राः, इला कन्या च पृ२०।१-६

## शर्मिष्ठा

- वृषपर्वणः पुत्री, ययातिनृपतिपत्नी, द्रुह्यु-अनु-पुरुणां जननी पृ२२।६-११

## शिवः

- ३० ब्रह्मा पृ२०।५१-७६  
—भगीरथतपसा प्रीतः शिवो गङ्गां स्वशिरसि दधार पृ२१।७-९  
—रामेण सेतुमध्ये शिवलिङ्गं स्थापितं, शिवस्यागमनं, शिवेन  
लिङ्गमाहात्म्यं प्रोक्तम् पृ२१।४६-५३  
—३० उपमन्युः पृ२५।१-९२  
—३० ब्रह्मा पृ२६।६६-११०

रुद्रः

—रुद्रभक्तः, द्व० कार्तवीर्यः

पू२२।१८-८७

सूरसेनः

—कार्तवीर्यपुत्रः, रुद्रभक्तः, द्व० कार्तवीर्यः

पू२२।१८-८७

श्वफल्कः

—वृष्णिपुत्रः, काशिराजपुत्र्या सह विवाहः, अक्रूरादयोऽस्य पुत्राः पू०।२४।४३-४४

संज्ञा

—त्वष्टकन्या, सूर्यपत्नी, वैवस्वतमनुरस्याः पुत्रः

पू२०।१-३

सगरः

—कारुणपुत्रः, प्रभामानुमतीनाम्न्यौ भार्ये, प्रभायां षष्ठिसहस्र-  
पुत्रोत्पत्तिं स्तथा भानुमत्याम् असमञ्जसनामैकः पुत्रः

पू२१।४-६

सप्तर्षयः

—वशिष्ठादयः, सप्तर्षिकर्तृकदेवतानिर्णयः

पू२२।३८-४९

सरस्वती

—देवी, द्व० नवरथः

पू२४।११-२६

साम्बः

—कृष्णजाम्बवतीपुत्रः, कृष्णवद्गुणसम्पन्नः

पू२७।१-२

सावर्णिमनुः

—सूर्यच्छायापुत्रः

पू२०।१-३

सावस्तिः

—शुवनाश्वपुत्रः, अनेन गौडदेशे सावस्तीपुरी निर्मिता  
[ द्व० पाठान्तराणि ]

पू२०।१९

सीता

—रामपत्नी, द्व० रामः

पू२१।१६-५६

सुग्रीवः

—वानरः, रामसखा, द्व० रामः

पू२१।१६-५६

सुषुम्नः

—अथमिहैव; अस्य उत्कल-गाय-विनताः पुत्राः

पू२०।६-१०



**सुबाहुः**

—गन्धर्वः, अस्य पत्नी हीमती आनकदुन्दुभिकन्या, अस्यापत्यानि पू२४।५५-६१

**हनूमान्**

—वानरः सुग्रीवानुगः, रामप्रियः; ऋ० रामः पू२१।१६-५६

**हर्यश्चः**

—बृहदश्वपुत्रः, कर्दमप्रसादात् अस्य सूर्यभक्तपुत्रप्राप्तिः पू२०।२८-२९

**हीमती**

—आनकदुन्दुभिकन्या, सुबाहुगन्धर्वेण सदास्या विवाहः,  
अस्यापत्यानि पू२४।५५-६१

**नवमः खण्डः—चरितम् [ वंशप्रकरणबहिर्भूतम् ]****विभागः—जातिः****जातिसामान्यम्**

—अन्नकर्तृका सृष्टिः (सनकादीनां पञ्चानां योगिनां लक्ष्य,  
अवग्न्यादीनां स्थानाभिमानिनां, मरीचिभृग्व्यादीनां साधकानां  
गृहमेधिनां, देवासुरपितृ-मनुष्याणां, राक्षससर्पभूतगन्धर्वादीनां,  
वयसाम्, अश्वगवादीनाम्, ओषधीनां ऋगादिवेदानां च) पू७।१९-७०

**जातिविशेषाः****अप्सराः**

—दक्षकन्यामुनिजाताः पू१८।१३

**उद्भिद् [= वृक्षलतादयः]**

—दक्षकन्या-हरा-जाता वृक्षादयः पू१८।१२

—मुख्यसर्गः = वृक्षोत्पत्तिः पू६।३-४

**ऋषिः**

—ऋषिवंशः, कश्यप-पुलस्त्य-पुलह-ऋतु-मरीचि-भृगु-अत्रि-कृशाश्व-  
वसिष्ठ-कृतः पू१९।१-२८

**गन्धर्वः**

—दक्षकन्या-अरिष्टा-जाताः पू१८।१०

## तिर्यक्

- दक्षकन्याताम्राजाताः (शुकीश्वेनादयः षट्) पृ० १८११  
 —दक्षकन्यासुरभितः गोमहिष-जन्म पृ० १८१२  
 —तिर्यक्-सर्गः पृ० ६१५-६

## दानवः

- दनुजाता तारादयः पृ० १८१८

## देवः

- आदित्याः अंशादयः आदितिजाताः पृ० १६१८-२०  
 —देवादिजातिषु उपास्या देवताः पृ० २२१४०-४१  
 —देवसर्गः पृ० ६१७ ८  
 —देवप्रहरणः कृशाश्वसुतः [ द्र० पाठान्तरम् ] पृ० १८११९

## देवासुरयुद्धम् [ विशिष्टम् ]

- हिरण्यकशिपुकृत-देवपराजयः पृ० १६१२३  
 —हिरण्याक्षकृत-देवपराजयः पृ० १६१७८-७९  
 —शिवगणैः देवैः च सहान्वकयुद्धम्, द्र० अन्वकः पृ० १६१३१-३३  
 —विरोचनकृत-देवपराजयः पृ० १७११-२  
 —बलिकृत-देवपराजयः पृ० १७१२-१३

## दैत्यः

- दितिजातौ हिरण्यकशिपु-हिरण्याक्षौ तयोर्वशाच्च पृ० १६१२०-१८१७

## नागः

- दक्षकन्याकद्रूजाता अनन्ताद्याः पृ० १८१०

## पिशाचभूतादयः

- भूतादिसृष्टिः पृ० ६११-१२

## मनुष्यः

- मनुष्याणां क्रमिकः शक्तिहासः पृ० २३२-३६  
 —अर्वाकसर्गः = मनुष्यसृष्टिः पृ० ६१९-१०

## यक्षः

- दक्षकन्याखसाजाताः [ अत्र तथास्थाने खसा पाठः स्यात् ] पृ० १८१३

## रक्षः

- दक्षकन्याखसाजाताः [ अत्र तथास्थाने खसापाठः स्यात् ] पृ० १८१३  
 —दक्षकन्याक्रोधवशाजाताः पृ० १८१३

सर्पः

—दक्षकन्यासुरसाजाताः अनेकशिरस्काः खेचराः

पू॥१८॥९

विभागः—व्यक्तिः [ सर्वाणि मुख्यानि चरितानि,  
कानिचित् गौणानि च ]

अग्निः

—दक्षकन्यास्वाहापतिः बह्विः

पू॥८॥१७-१९

—स्वाहापत्यानि, ४९ चक्षुः रुद्रात्मकाः

पू॥१३॥१४-१८

—दक्षयज्ञे गणेश्वरेणाग्निः पराजितः

पू॥१५॥३-८०

—सीतारक्षार्थमग्निना मायासीता निर्मिता, छायासीता रावणेन

गृहीता, रावणवधानन्तरं रामसंशयापनोदनाय सीताऽग्निगर्भे

प्रविष्टा, अग्निना सा रक्षिता, तस्याः पातिव्रत्यं च प्रतिपादितम् उ॥३४॥११२-१४१

अग्निष्वात्ताः

—पितृविशेषाः, इ० पितरः

पू॥१३॥९-२३

अङ्गिराः

—गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मशिरसो जन्म

पू॥७॥४-३९

—दक्षकन्यापतिः, अस्य अपत्यानि [ अन्न पाठो अष्टः, सम्यक्

पाठस्तु विष्णुपुराणे पू॥१५॥१३६ ] इ० पू॥१६॥५-६

पू॥१८॥१८

—अस्य पत्नी स्मृतिः, तदपत्यानि; इ० पू॥९॥१७-२०

पू॥१३॥८-९

अत्रिः

—गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मनेत्रतो जन्म

पू॥७॥३४-३९

—अत्रिऋषिवंशः, वह्निरस्य पुत्रः

पू॥१६॥१८-१९

—अनसूयास्य पत्नी, तदपत्यानि इ० पू॥८॥१७-२०

पू॥१३॥७-८

अदितिः

—दक्षकन्या, द्वादशादित्यजननी

पू॥१६॥१७-२०

—बलिष्ठत-इन्द्रपराजयः, इन्द्रमातुरदितेः तपश्चरणम्, अदिति-

गर्भे विष्णोः वामनरूपेण जन्म बलिचरितं च ।

पू॥१७॥१२-६९

अधर्मः

—तमोयुक्तब्रह्मणोऽधर्मस्य जन्म, तत्पत्नी हिंसा

पू॥८॥१-५

—अधर्महिंसापत्यानि

पू॥८॥२५-२९

अनसूया

—अग्निपत्नी ऋ० अग्निः

{ पृ० ८१७-२०  
पृ० १३१७-८

अनुहादः

—हिरण्यकशिपुपुत्रः, ऋ० हिरण्यकशिपुः

पृ० १६१०-७७

अन्धकः

—हिरण्याक्षपुत्रः, देवीप्राप्तये तस्य प्रयासः, शिवान्धकयुद्धं, अन्धकस्य पलायनम्, पुनः विष्णुसौलादिप्रभृतिभिरस्य युद्धं शिवशूलप्रोथितेनान्धकेन शिवस्तुतिः, शिवकर्तृकं तस्मै गाण-पत्यप्रदानं ; कथान्तरैः सह

पृ० १६१५-२३८

अरिष्टनेमिः [०नेमिन्-पाठा०]

—दक्षकन्यापतिः, तस्य षोडशापत्यानि ; ऋ० पृ० १६१५-६

पृ० १८१७

अरिष्टा

—दक्षकन्या, कदयपपत्नी, गन्धर्वजननी

पृ० १८१०

अरुणः

—विनताकदयपुत्रः, महादेवप्रसादतः अस्य सूर्यसारथित्वम्

पृ० १८१४-१५

अरुन्धती

—दक्षकन्या, धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राः

पृ० १६१७-११

—वसिष्ठपत्नी, शक्तिजननी

पृ० १६१०-२३

—नग्नशिवस्य अरुन्धतीसमीपे आगमनम्

उ० ३८३४-३८

अर्जुनः [=पार्थः]

—व्यामेनार्जुनं प्रति युगधर्मकथनं, व्यासोपदेशेन अर्जुनस्य शिबे भक्तिः

पृ० २८१३-३०१९

अश्विनो

—प्राचेतसदक्षपत्नी, शीरणप्रजापतिकन्या, सुतानां षष्टिकन्यानां च जननी

पृ० १६११-६

असितः

—असितपत्नी एकपर्णा, तन्मुत्तो देवलः

पृ० १६१५

आकूतिः

—स्वावम्भुवमनुकन्या, रुचिपत्नी, द्वादशायामदेवानां जननी

पृ० ८१९-१४

## आग्नीध्रः

—प्रियव्रतपुत्रः, जम्बूद्वीपेश्वरः

पू० ४०।६-१०

—आग्नीध्रपुत्राणां जम्बूद्वीपीयवर्षाधिपतित्वम्, आग्नीध्रस्य तपश्चरणम्

पू० ४०।२८-३६

—आग्नीध्रवंशः

पू० ४०।३७-४७

## आदित्यः

—अदितिजाता द्वादशादित्याः

पू० १६।१८-२०

## इन्द्रः

—बलिकृत-इन्द्रपराजयः, वामनेन बलिः पाताले स्थापितः, इन्द्राय राज्यं दत्तं च

पू० १७।१२-६९

—इन्द्रो वाणः

पू० १८।१-७

## इन्द्रद्युम्नः

—इन्द्रद्युम्नः पूर्वजन्मनि वृषः, विष्णुप्रसादेन च ततो विप्रः, तस्य तपश्चरणं, तस्य श्रीदेवीदर्शनं, श्रीतत्त्वं, श्रीकथनेन विष्णुदर्शनार्थं तस्य तपश्चरणं, विष्णुना इन्द्रद्युम्नायोपदेशो दत्तः, इन्द्रद्युम्नस्य सुक्तिश्च

पू० ११।४१-१२२

## इरा

—दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, वृक्षगुल्मादिजननी

पू० १८।१२

## उत्तानपादः

—स्वायम्भुवमनुपुत्रः, तस्य पुत्रो ध्रुवः

पू० १४।१-२

## ऊर्जा

—वसिष्ठपत्नी, तदपत्यानि

पू० १३।१२-१३

## ऋषभः

—नाभिपुत्रः, भरतपिता, पाशुपतस्यास्य तपश्चरणम्

पू० ४०।३८-४०

## कद्रूः

—दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, नागजननी

पू० १८।१०

## कश्यपः

—अस्मै दक्षकृत-त्रयोदश कन्यादानम् (पू० १६।५), अदिति दित्यादित्रयोदशानां पत्नीनां पुत्राः

पू० १६।१७-१८।१६

—कश्यपर्विवंशः,

पू१६१-७

—मरीचिपुत्रः

पू१६१६

कूर्मः

—क्षीरसागरमन्थनकाले विष्णोः कूर्मरूपधारणम्, तेन श्रीगृहीता,  
कूर्मेण श्रीतत्त्वं भाषितम्

पू११२७-४०

—श्रियाः विष्णोश्च ( कूर्मस्य ) प्रसादेन इन्द्रद्युम्नस्य मोक्षलाभः

पू११४१-१२३

कृशाश्वः

—दक्षकन्यापतिः, देवप्रहरणाः अस्य पुत्राः, [इ० पू१६१५-६]

पू१८१७

कृष्णः

—वाराणसीस्थ-मध्यदेश्वरतीर्थे देवकीसुतः कृष्णः शिवं पूजितवान्

पू३४१०-२३

कृष्णद्वैपायनः [इ० व्यासोऽपि]

—पराशरपुत्रः, शुक्रोऽस्य पुत्रः

पू१६१२४-२५

कैकसी

—विश्रवसः पत्नी, रावणादयोऽस्य पुत्राः

पू१६१९-१२

कैटभः

—सृष्टिकाले विष्णुनामिपद्मे पितामहस्थितिः, मधुकैटभागमनं,  
जिष्णुः कैटभं, विष्णुः मधुंश्च व्यजयत

पू१०११-६

क्रतुः

—ब्रह्मणो मानसः पुत्रो, योगी

पू७११९-२१

—गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मापानतो जन्म

पू७३४-३९

—वैवस्वतेऽन्तरे अनपत्योऽयम्

पू१६१६

—सन्ततिरस्य पत्नी, तदपत्यानि ; [इ० पू८१७-२०]

पू१३१११

क्रोधवशा

—दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, रक्षोगणजननी

पू१८१३

क्षमा

—पुलहपत्नी एतदपत्यम्

पू१३१६-७

खसा

पू८१७-२०

—दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, यक्षरक्षोजननी

पू१८१३

[ दक्षकन्या-गणना-श्लोके नास्याः नाम पठ्यते, पाठस्तु अष्टः,  
तथैव कन्यान्वयप्रस्तावश्लोकेऽपि नास्याः नाम पू१८१३ ;  
अत्र 'तथा वै' इति स्थाने 'खसा वै' इति स्यात् ; इ० विष्णु  
१२११२४ ]

## ख्यातिः

—भृगुपत्नी, तदपत्यम् [ब० पू० ८।१७-२०]

पू० १३।१-३

## गणेशः

—प्राचेतस-दक्षेण शिवहीन-यज्ञ आरब्धः, शिवजातद्वैर्यज्ञस्य नाशः,

‘स्वमन्ते गणेशानो भविष्यसीति’ शिवेन वरो दत्तो दक्षाय

पू० १५।१-७८

—गणेशैः शिवगणैः सह अन्धकयुद्धं, शिवशूत्रेण अन्धकः प्रोथितः पू० १६।१३१-२३८

## गरुडः

—विनता-कश्यप-पुत्रः, हरिवाहनत्वं प्राप्तवान् च

पू० १८।१४

## गौतमः

—अनावृष्ट्या दासवनौकसां सुनीनां गौतमसमीपे आगमनं,

सुनिमाया-सृष्ट-गोर्नाशः कृतो गौतमेन, ततश्च गौतमेन मुनयः

शप्ताः, त्रयीवाद्यानां सुनीनां कृते मोहशास्त्रप्रवर्तनम्

विष्णुना शिवेन च

पू० १६।९७-१३१

## जैमिनिः

—व्यासं प्रति जैमिनेः श्रेयोविषयकः प्रश्नः, व्यासस्य वाराणसी-

माहात्म्यविषयकं कथनं च, ततश्च व्यासस्य वाराणसी-प्रवेशः

पू० ३१।१-८०

—सामवेदप्रवक्ता, व्यासशिष्यः

पू० ५२।१२-१४

## ज्योतिष्मान्

—प्रियव्रतपुत्रः, कुशद्वीपाधिपतिः

पू० ४०।६-१२

—अस्य वर्षाधिपतयः पुत्राः

पू० ४०।२२-२३

## ताम्रा

—दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, शुक्रयादि-षट्कन्या-जननी

पू० १८।११

## दक्षः

—गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मप्राणतो जन्म

पू० ७।३५-३९

—दशभ्यः, प्रवेतोभ्यो मारिषायामस्य जन्म; अयमादौ ब्रह्मसुत

आसीत्, ततश्च शिवशापात् प्राचेतसरूपेण जन्म, एतद्यज्ञे अस्य

कन्यायाः सत्याः देहत्यागः

पू० १४।५४-६५

—नारदं प्रति दक्षस्य शपः

पू० १६।२०-२२

- प्राचेतसदक्षकृतयज्ञस्य शिवोत्पन्नवीरभद्रकर्तृकनाशः पृ० १५११-१९  
 —पष्टिकन्याप्रदानं, धर्मकश्यपादिभ्यः पृ० १६११-६  
 —दक्षकन्यान्वयः ( कथान्तरैः सह ) पृ० १६११-१८१९

दक्षः

- अयं स्वायम्भुवः ; स्वायम्भुवमनुकन्या-प्रसूतिपतिः, प्रसूत्याः २४  
 कन्याः, धर्मभृवाद्यः तासां पतयः पृ० ८१९-२०  
 —स्वायम्भुव-दक्षकन्यानां खयात्यादीनां भृवाद्यः पतयः, तदपत्यानि पृ० १३११-२४

दधीचः

- शिवभक्तेनानेन दक्षः प्रार्थितः शिवानयनार्थं यज्ञे, अनेन  
 शिवद्रोहिणो ब्राह्मणाः क्षप्ताः पृ० १५११-१९

दधीचिः = दधीचः द्र०

पृ० १५११-१९

दनुः

- दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, तारादशो दानवा अस्याः पुत्राः पृ० १८१८

दितिः

- दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, दितिजातयो हिंरण्यकशिपु-हिरण्या-  
 क्षयोर्वशः पृ० १६१२०-१८१७

देवलः

- असित-एकपर्णापुत्रः, योगाचार्यः पृ० १९१५

देववर्णिनी

- विश्रवसः पत्नी, तस्याः वैश्रवणः पुत्रः पृ० १९१९-११

देवी [ शिवपत्नीरूपिणी ; प्रदत्तं नाम खलु पुराण-प्रसिद्धयनुसारेण ]

- दक्षदुहिता सती, रुद्रपत्नी, पुनः हिमवन्मेनापुत्री, तत्स्वरूपं  
 रुद्रस्वरूपं च पृ० ११११-१५

- सत्याः देव्याः स्वरूपम्, शक्तिरूपायाः तस्याः निरूपणम्,  
 मेनाहिमवत्कन्यारूपेण जन्म, देव्याः १००८ नामानि,  
 हिमवन्तं प्रति देव्या उपदेशः, शिवाय पार्वती प्रदत्ता हिमवता पृ० १२११-३२४

- स्वमितुर्दक्षस्य ग्रहं सत्या आगमनं, भर्तृनिन्दाश्रवणेन देवी  
 आत्मानं वदाह, दक्षं प्रति शिवस्य शापः पृ० १४१५४-६५

- दक्षयज्ञनाशार्थं शिवः प्रार्थितो देव्या, शिवजातवीरभद्रेण यज्ञो  
 निवृत्तः पृ० १५११-१९



—हिरण्यक्षपुत्रस्यान्धकस्य मन्दरस्थ-उमाप्राप्तये प्रयासः, सैरव-  
रुपिणा शिवेन अन्धकः पराजितः, अन्धककृतं देवीप्रसादनम्;  
कथान्तरैः सह

पू१६।९५-२३०

—इ० व्यासः

पू३६।२२-३०

### द्युतिमान्

—प्रियव्रतपुत्रः, क्रौञ्चद्वीपाधिपतिः

पू४०।६-१२

—अस्य वर्षाधिपतयः पुत्राः

पू४०।१९-२१

### धर्मः

—गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मव्यवसायतो जन्म

पू७।३४-३९

—दश-दक्षकन्यानां मरुत्वत्यादीनां पतिः, एतासां कन्यानां पुत्राश्च

पू१६।५-१६

—दक्षपत्नीप्रसूतिः स्वार्थभुवमनुकन्या, तस्याः २४ कन्याः,  
धर्मभृग्वादयस्तासां पतयः, धर्मवंशश्च

पू८।१४-२५

### धारिणी

—पितृपत्नीस्वधाकन्या

पू१३।१९-२०

—एतदपत्यम्

पू१३।२३

### ध्रुवः

—उत्तानपादपुत्रः, नारायण-भक्त (ध्रुववंशश्च अस्मिन्नध्याये)

पू४४।१-२

### नन्दी

—शिलादपुत्रः इ० शिलादः

उ४३।१७-४२

### नारदः

—प्राचेतसदक्षपुत्रनाशो नारदमायया

पू१६।१-४

—नारदं प्रति दक्षस्य शापः येन नारदो निरपत्योऽभवत्

पू१९।२०-२२

### नारायणः

—धर्मसुतः, नारायणसमीपे शिवानामनं, ज्ञानोपदेशार्थं शिवः  
प्रार्थितो नारायणेन, शिवकर्तृकोपदेशः, अयं विष्णुरित्यपि  
अस्मिन्नध्याये स्पष्टम्

उ१।१५-५१

### नीललोहित-रुद्रः

—ब्रह्मतो जन्म, ब्रह्मनिर्देशात् रुद्रसृष्टिः

पू७।२२-३१

### नृसिंहः

—विष्णुरूपी इ० हिरण्यकशिपुः

पू१६।२०-७७

पराशरः

—शक्तिपुत्रः, कृष्णद्वैपायनोऽस्य पुत्रः

पू१९१२०-२४

पार्थः = अर्जुनः द्र०

पू२८११-३०६९

पितरः

—द्विधा पितरोऽग्निध्वस्तवर्हिषदमेदात्, एतत्पत्नी स्वभा, तद-  
पत्यानि [ द्र० पू८१७-२० ]

पू१३१९-२३

पिशचिः [ नाम नास्ति ] द्र० शङ्कुकर्णः

पू२३११-५३

पुलस्त्यः

—गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मोदानात् जन्म

पू७३५-३९

—पुलस्त्यर्षिवंशः

पू१६१७-१४

—प्रीतिरस्य पत्नी, तदपत्यानि [ द्र० पू८१७-२० ]

पू१३१९-१०

पुलहः

—गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मव्यानतो जन्म

पू७३५-३९

—पुलहर्षिवंशः, मृगव्यालादयोऽस्य पुत्राः

पू१६१५

—क्षमाऽस्य पत्नी, तदपत्यानि [ द्र० पू८१७-२० ]

पू१३१९-७

पुष्पोत्कटा

—विश्रवसः पत्नी, महोदरादयोऽस्य पुत्राः

पू१९११०-१३

पृथिवी

—वराह-कर्तृक-पृथिव्युद्धारः

पू६११-२५

—इथु-कर्तृक-पृथिवीवोहनम्

पू१४११०-१२

पृथुः

—वेनपुत्रः, पृथ्वीदोहकः, पुत्रोऽस्य सिखण्डी

पू१४११०-२२

पैलः

—व्यासशिष्यः, ऋग्वेदपाठकः

पू५२१२-१३

प्रचेतसः

—इमे प्राचीनवर्हिःपुत्राः दश ; एतेषां पुत्रो दक्षः

पू१४१५२-५४

प्रसूतिः

—स्वायम्भुवमनुकन्या, दक्षपत्नी, अस्माद्विचतुर्वंशतिकन्याजननी

पू८१९-१५

## प्रह्लादः [ प्रह्लादोऽपि ]

- हिरण्यकशिपोरन्यतमः पुत्रः, नरसिंहरूपिणा विष्णुना सहास्य युद्धं, ततश्च प्रह्लादकृत-विष्णुस्तुतिः पृ० १६।२३-७७
- प्रह्लादकर्तृकराज्यपालनं, नारायण-प्रह्लाद-युद्धं, प्रह्लादस्य पराजयः, विष्णौ तस्य भक्तिश्च पृ० १६।८४-९४
- वामनजन्मानन्तरं बल्ये प्रह्लादेन विष्णुतत्त्वमुपदिष्टम्, पुनः पातालस्थाय बल्ये हरिपूजादिविषया अनेन कथिताः पृ० १७।१२-६९

## प्राचीनवर्हिः

- हविर्धान-आत्रेयी-पुत्रः, धनुर्वेद-पारगः, दश प्रचेतसोऽस्य पुत्राः पृ० १४।५१-५३

## प्रियव्रतः

- स्वायम्भुवमनुशतरूपपुत्रः पृ० ८।१०-११
- स्वार्थभुवमनुपुत्रः, धर्मज्ञः पृ० १४।१
- स्वायम्भुवमनुपुत्रः, अस्य दशपुत्राः, सप्तानां द्वीपाधिपतित्वं, त्रयाणां च योगित्वम् पृ० ४०।५-१३

## प्रीतिः

- पुलस्त्यपत्नी ऋ० पुलस्त्यः { पृ० १।१७-२०  
{ पृ० १३।९-१०

## प्रेतः

- नाम नास्ति ऋ० शङ्खुकर्णः पृ० ३३।१-५३

## बर्हिषदः

- ऋ० पितरः पृ० १३।१९-२३

## बलिः

- बलिकृतेन्द्रपराजयः, इन्द्रमातुरदितेः तपश्चरणम्, अदितिगर्भे विष्णोर्वाग्मिनरूपेण जन्म, बल्ये प्रह्लादेन विष्णुतत्त्वोपदेशः कृतः, बलियज्ञे वामनागमनं, वामनाज्ञया बलेः पातालस्थितिः, पाताले बलिकृतविष्णुपूजा पृ० १७।१२-६९

## बहुपुत्रः

- दक्षकन्यापतिः, अस्य सुताः चतस्रो विद्युतः—[ऋ० पृ० १६।५-६] पृ० १८।१८

## बाणः

- बलिसुतः, अनेनेन्द्रः पराजितः, ततश्च शिवोऽस्य पुरं ददाह, बाणेन शिवः प्रसादितः, शिवेनास्मै गाणपत्यं प्रदत्तम् पृ० १८।१-५

## ब्रह्महत्या

—३० शिवः (अत्र ब्रह्महत्याया कन्यात्वं दर्शितम् ७।३१।६७) ७।३१।१-१०७

## ब्रह्मा [३० सर्गप्रकरणमपि]

- विष्णुतः ब्रह्मरद्राशीणां सृष्टिः, विष्णुनिर्देशेन श्रिया जगन्मोहितम् ५।२।१-२२
- ब्रह्मणा चराचर-मरीच्यादिसृष्टिः, धर्मादिविवरणं, ब्रह्ममहिमा, ब्रह्मविष्णुरुद्राणामैक्यं च ५।२।२१-२८
- सृष्टिकर्तृब्रह्मणः स्वरूपं माहात्म्यं नामनिर्वचनं च ५।४।३७-६५
- ब्राह्ममहः, ब्रह्मणः परार्धकालश्च ५।५।१७-२५
- चराहावतारः, [अत्र ब्रह्मा = नारायणः] ५।६।१-२५
- विष्णुतः पद्माविर्भावः, तत्सकाशे ब्रह्मण वागमनम्, विष्णोस्वरूपे ब्रह्मणः अनुप्रवेशः, ब्रह्मविष्णु-विवादः, शिवागमनम्, 'शिवो मम पुत्रोऽस्तु' इति ब्रह्मणः प्रार्थना शिवं प्रति, शिवभक्ति-लाभाय विष्णोः प्रार्थना च ५।६।१-१।८७
- ब्रह्मणः मयुकैटभनाशार्थं प्रार्थना, तदनन्तरं ब्रह्मकर्तृका सृष्टिः, क्रुद्धब्रह्मणः प्रेतादिसृष्टिः, प्रजापतिमरणानन्तरं रुद्रजन्म, रुद्रात् रुद्राणां जन्म, ब्रह्मकर्तृक-शिवस्तुतिः, शिवस्वरूपं च ५।१०।१-९०
- तपस्विब्रह्मणः अर्थनारीश्वरजन्म, रुद्रशक्ति-देवीस्वरूपम्, शिव-पार्वती-विवाहश्च ५।११।१-१६
- दक्ष-यज्ञनाशानन्तरं ब्रह्मोपदेशतः दक्षस्य शिव-भजनम् ५।११।८०-९९
- हिरण्यकशिपुकृत-देवपराजयः; ब्रह्मप्रार्थनया विष्णोः नृसिंह-रूपेणाविर्भावः, नृसिंहकृत-हिरण्यकशिपुवधश्च ५।१६।२०-७७
- ३० शिवः ७।३१।१-१०८
- ३० शिवः ७।३६।११-३८
- ३० शिवः ७।३८।१-३६।८०

## मरतः

—नामिपुत्रस्य कृष्णभस्यायं पुत्रः, तपस्वी, महापाशुपतश्च ५।४०।३७-४०

भग्नः [३० पाठा०; हव्य इति मुद्रितः पाठः, विष्णु २।१।१४ भग्न्येव पाठः]

—भ्रियवतपुत्रः, शाकद्वीपाधिपतिः, तत्पुत्राः, शाकद्वीपीय-वर्षाणि च ५।४०।१३; ५।४०।१६-१९

## भानुः

—दक्षकन्या, धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राः ५।१६।७-११

## भृगुः-

- गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्महृदयतो जन्म पृ० ७।३५-३९  
 —भृगुऋषिवंशः पृ० १६।१७  
 —भृगुपत्नी ख्यातिः, तदपत्यम् [पृ० ८।१७-२० पृ०] पृ० १३।१-३

## भैरवः

- ३० शिवः उ० ३ ११-१०८  
 —शिवेन भैरवरूपिणा अन्धकस्य वधः, कथान्तरैः सह पृ० १६।९५-२३८

## मङ्गणकः

- सप्तसारस्वतस्थो मुनिः, शिवभक्तः, शिवेनास्मै शिवतत्त्वज्ञानं प्रदिष्टम् उ० ३५।४४-७६

## मधुः

- सृष्टिकर्तृब्रह्मसमीपे मधुकैटभागमनं, जिष्णुना विष्णुना च कैटभस्य मधोश्च वधः पृ० १०।१-६

## मनुः

- स्वायम्भुवमनुर्धर्मान् प्रोवाच, तच्छिष्या भृगवादयश्च धर्मानूचिरे [३० मनुमतविषये दशमः खण्डः] पृ० २।३७-७८

## मरीचिः

- गृहमेधिनः प्रजापतेरस्य ब्रह्मचक्षुर्भ्यां जन्म पृ० ७।३४-३९  
 —मरीचि-ऋषि-वंशः पृ० १९।१६  
 —मरीचिपत्नी संभूतिः, तदपत्यानि ; [३० पृ० ८।१७-२०] पृ० १३।४-५

## मस्तवती

- धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राश्च पृ० १६।७-११

## मातरः

- अन्धकपराजयानन्तरं मातृकर्तृकलोकभक्षणप्रयासः, वृत्तिह-  
 वपुषा विष्णुना ताः प्रबोधिताः, शिवशरणं गताश्च । पृ० १६।२२२-२३७

## मारिषा

- दशप्रचेतःपत्नी, एतद्गणभै दक्षस्य जन्म पृ० १४।५४

## मार्कण्डेयः

- राज्यप्राप्त्यनन्तरं युधिष्ठिरस्य मोहः, तस्मै पापनाशार्थमनेन  
 प्रयागमाहात्म्यं कथितम् पृ० ३६।३-१८

मुनिः

—दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, अप्सरोजननी च

पू१२।१३

मुहूर्तः

—दक्षकन्या, धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राः

पू१६।७-११

मेधातिथिः

—प्रियव्रतपुत्रः लक्ष्मदीपाधिपतिः

पू४०।६-११

—अस्य वर्षाधिपतयः पुत्राः

पू४०।२६-२७

मेना

—पितृपत्नी-स्वधा-कन्या, हिमवत्-पत्नी, तदपत्यानि

पू१३।१९-२२

—देवी पार्वती अस्याः कन्या, देवीरूपविषये मेनया हिमालयः

सूचितः ।

पू१२।४०-४५

मेरुः

—स्वधाकन्याधारिणीपतिः, तदपत्यानि

पू१३।१९-२०, २३

यामाः

—देवविशेषाः यज्ञ-दक्षिणापत्यानि

पू८।१३-१४

यामी

—दक्षकन्या, धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राश्च

पू१६।७-११

युधिष्ठिरः

—राज्यप्राप्त्यनन्तरमस्य मोहः, पापनाशार्थं मार्कण्डेयं प्रति प्रश्नः,

मार्कण्डेय-कर्तृक-प्रयागमाहात्म्यकथनारम्भः ।

पू३६।३-१८

रामः—द्र० अग्निः

उ।३४।११२-१४१

रावणः—द्र० अग्निः

उ।३४।१११-१४१

रुचिः

—प्रत्रापतिः, स्वायम्भुवमनुकन्या-आकृतिपतिः, ततो यज्ञ-दक्षिणा-

जन्म, यज्ञतो यामदेवजन्म च

पू८।९-१४

रुद्रः

—ब्रह्मतो नीललोहितरुद्रस्य जन्म, तेन रुद्राणां स्वसदृशानां

सृष्टिः कृता

पू।७।२२-३१

—३० शिवः

पू११।२-३

—३० शिवः

उ।३६।११-३८

रुद्राः

—द्र० शिवः

पृ॥१५॥१-१९

रोमहर्षणः

—सूतोऽयं व्यासशिष्यः, इतिहासपुराणप्रवक्ता (नात्र रोमहर्षणनामास्ति) पृ॥१२॥१३-१५

लक्ष्मीः=श्रीः द्र०

पृ॥२॥१-२२

लम्बा

—दक्षकन्या, धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राश्च

पृ॥१६॥७-११

वपुष्मान्

—प्रियव्रतपुत्रः, शात्मलक्ष्मीपाविपतिः, अस्य पुत्राश्च

{ पृ॥४०॥६-११;  
पृ॥४०॥२४-२५

वराहः

—वराहावतारेण पृथिवीं लब्धुता

पृ॥६॥१-२५

—वराहेण वेदहर्ता हिरण्याक्षो निबृदितः

पृ॥१६॥७७-८४

वसवः

—वसुजाताः अष्टौ ध्रुवादयः, तेषां पुत्राश्च ; [वसुरपि द्र०]

पृ॥१६॥११-१६

वसिष्ठः

—गृहमेधिनोऽस्य ब्रह्मसमानात् जन्म

पृ॥७॥३४-३९

—वसिष्ठपत्नी कजी तदपत्यम् [द्र० पृ॥८॥१७-२०]

पृ॥१३॥२-१३

—वसिष्ठ-ऋषिवंशः, अरुन्धती अस्य पत्नी

पृ॥१६॥२०-२७

वसुः

—धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राः, वसुजाता अष्टौ वसवः, तेषां पुत्राश्च पृ॥१६॥५-१६

वह्निः=अग्निः द्र०

पृ॥८॥१७-१९

वाका

—विश्रवसः पत्नी, कुम्भीनसी अस्याः कन्या

पृ॥१६॥१०-१४

वामनः

—द्र० विष्णुः

पृ॥१७॥१२-६९

विनता

—दक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, गरुडा रुणजननी

पृ॥१८॥१४

## विरोचनः

—प्रह्लादसुतः, सनत्कुमारेणास्मै उपदेशो दत्तः, पुत्राय राज्यं  
दत्वाऽयं योगाभ्यासी बभूव

पू१७।१-११

## विश्वनाः

—पुरुस्त्यवंशीयः, तस्य चतस्रः पत्न्यः, तेभ्यो रुद्रभक्त्यानां  
राक्षसादीनां राक्षसानां जन्म

पू१८।१-१४

## विश्वकर्मा

—प्रभासनामक-वसु-पुत्रः, शिल्प-कर्ता

पू१६।१३-१६

## विश्वा

—दक्षकन्या, धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राश्च

पू१६।७-११

## विष्णुः

—३० कूर्मः

पू१।२७-४०

—३० इन्द्रद्युम्नः

पू१।४१-१२२

—विष्णुतो ब्रह्मरुद्रजन्म, विष्णोराज्ञया श्रिया जगन्मोहितम्

पू२।१-२२

—ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवैक्यम्, एतत्स्वरूपं च

पू२, ९०-९८

—वराहरूपिणा नारायणेन पृथिव्युद्धारः

पू६।१-२५

—३० ब्रह्मा

पू८।५-८७

—मयुकैटभक्षः, वैष्णवीं निद्रां गतश्च ब्रह्मा, ततो ब्रह्मा सृष्टिं ससर्ज

पू१०।१-१२

—विष्णुनिर्देशेन दक्षकृतो यज्ञ आरब्धः, शिवगर्णः सह विष्णु-  
वाहन-गरुडस्य युद्धम्, दक्षयज्ञनाशः कृतो वीरभद्रेण

पू१५।१-९९

—नरसिंहरूपिणा हिरण्यकशिपु ईतः

पू१६।२०-७७

—वराहरूपिणा विष्णुना हिरण्याक्षो हतः

पू१६।७७-८४

—नारायण-प्रह्लाद-युद्धम्, प्रह्लादपराजयः, विष्णौ तस्य भक्तिश्च

पू१६।८४-९४

—दारुवनस्था मुनयो गौतमेन शप्ताः, ततस्ते त्रयीवाच्या जाताः,

तेषां कृते विष्णुना शिवेन च मोहनानि शास्त्राणि प्रणीतानि

पू१६।९७-१३१

—अदितिगर्भे बलिपराजयार्थं विष्णोर्षीर्मान-रूपेणाविर्भावः,

३० बलिर्पि

पू१७।१२-६९

—स्वार्थसुवादिसप्तमन्वन्तरेषु विष्णोर्वताराः, विष्णोः चत्वारि  
रूपाणि, विष्णु-माहात्म्यं च

पू५।१२६-५०

—विष्णोः वैष्णवानां भागवतानां च विवरणं शाकद्दीपस्थ-

श्वेतद्वीपीयानाम्

पू४।४०-७२

—३० शिवः

उ३।११-१०८

—३० शिवः

उ३।८।१-३८।८०



## विष्वक्सेनः

—विष्णोरंशसमुद्भवः द्वारपालः, शिवेनायं हतः

उ३१।७७-८४

## वीरमद्रः

—शिवोत्पन्नेनानेन दक्षयज्ञस्य नाशः कृतः

पू१५।१-९९

## वैशम्पायनः

—व्यासशिष्यः, यजुर्वेद-प्रवक्ता

पू५२।१२-१४

## व्यासः [ = वेदव्यासः कृष्णद्वैपायनश्च ]

—अर्जुनं प्रति युगधर्मोपदेशः

पू२८।१-३०।६९

—व्यासकर्तृकवाराणसीस्थविर्मिलिङ्गपूजनं, शिष्यादीन् प्रत्युपदेशश्च

पू३१।१-३५।३३

—अष्टाविंशति व्यासविवरणम् तत्कृतवेदविभागः

पू५२।१-११

—पाराशर्यव्यासकर्तृकवेदपुराणविभागः, वेदमहिमा च

पू५२।१२-२६

—मिश्रामप्राप्य वाराणसीस्थितो व्यासः शापं दत्तुमुपचक्रमे, देवीवचनेन व्यासस्य वाराणसी-पार्श्वतः स्थितिः

पू३५।२२-४०

## शङ्कुकर्णः

—शिवभक्तः, कपर्दीश्वरसमीपस्थपिशाचमोचनकुण्डवासी, क्षत्र्योपदेशतः प्रेतो दिव्यरूपो बभूव, शङ्कुकर्णश्च शिवलिङ्गलीनः सञ्जातः

पू३३।१-५३

## शतरूपा

—स्वायंभुवमनु-पत्नी, ब्रह्मार्धरूपिणी, पुत्रद्वय-कन्याद्वयजननी च

पू५।५-११

## शाण्डिल्यः

—कश्यपवंशजः, शिवप्रसादाद् योगमातृवान्

पू१६।६

## शिलादः

—अयोनिजपुत्रलाभाय अस्य तपः, नन्दिजन्म, नन्दिनो रुद्रभक्तिः, नन्दिनो विवाहः

उ४३।१७-४२

## शिवः [ रुद्रमहादेवादयोऽपि ]

—विष्णुतो ब्रह्म-रुद्रश्रीणां जन्म

पू२।१-७

—३० रुद्रः

पू७।२२-३१

- विष्णुनाभ्यन्तरे ब्रह्मणः प्रवेशः, ततश्च निर्गमनं, ब्रह्मविष्णु-  
विवादः, तदनन्तरं शिवागमनम्, ब्रह्माणं प्रति शिवस्य वरदानं,  
शिवभक्त्यर्थं विष्णोः प्रार्थना पृ॥६॥१-८७
- रुद्रप्रादुर्भावः, तस्य नामानि, पत्न्यः, स्थानानि च, शिवरुद्र-  
स्वरूपं च, ब्रह्मकर्तृकशिवस्तुतिः पृ॥१०॥२२-८७
- अर्धनारीश्वरः, तत एकादशरुद्राः, देव्या सत्या पार्वत्या च  
सह विवाहः पृ॥११॥१-१६
- दक्षशिवविरोधः, दक्षं प्रति शिवस्य शापः पृ॥१४॥५४-६५
- प्राचेतस-दक्षेन शिवह्रीनो यज्ञ आरब्धः, यज्ञनाशार्थं शिवः  
प्रार्थितो देव्यः, शिवोत्पन्नेन वीरभद्रेणान्यैश्च रुद्रैः यज्ञो  
निपूदितः, दक्षकृतशिवभजनं च पृ॥१५॥१-१९
- द्र० विष्णुः पृ॥१६॥९६-१११
- शिवपत्नीप्राप्तये शिवेन सह अन्धकस्य युद्धम्, अन्धक-पराजयः,  
पुनश्च विष्णुगणेशादिभिः अन्धकस्य युद्धं, शिवशस्त्रेनान्धकः  
प्रोषितः, अन्धककृतशिवस्तुतिः, अन्धकाय गाणपत्यप्रदानं  
कृतं शिवेन पू॥१६॥१३१-२३८
- द्रा० बाणः पृ॥१८॥१-७
- कलौ शङ्करावतारः श्रौतस्मार्त-प्रतिष्ठार्थम् पृ॥२०॥३३-३६
- शिवस्य कृत्तिवासनामकारणं, कृत्तिवासेश्वरलिङ्गं वाराणसीस्थम् पृ॥२२॥१२-२९
- इ० शङ्कुकर्णः पृ॥२३॥१-५३
- महादेवावताराः शैवयोगिनश्च पृ॥२३॥१-२८
- सनत्कुमारप्रमुखानां तपश्चरणम्, धर्मसुतनारायणकथनेन एतान्  
प्रति शिवस्योपदेशः, ( ईश्वरगीतायाम् अन्तराऽन्तरा शिव-  
महिमा वर्णितः ) उ॥१॥५-५१
- शिवकर्तृकब्रह्मशिरस्छेदनं, ब्रह्महत्यानिवारक-कपालमोचनतीर्थो-  
त्पत्तिश्च उ॥३१॥१-१०८
- मङ्गलणक-तपश्चरणं, शिवविषयकं ज्ञानमस्मै शिवेन दत्तम् उ॥३५॥४४-७६
- रुद्रकोटितीर्थमाहात्म्य-प्रसङ्गे ब्रह्मर्षिकोटि-कर्तृक-शिवदर्शनम् उ॥३६॥१-८
- द्र० श्वेतः उ॥३६॥११-३८
- दाक्षनस्थानामृषीणां तपश्चरणं, विष्णुना सह नमःशिवस्यागमनं,  
ऋषिभिः सह शिवस्य संवादः, अरुन्धतीसमीपे शिवागमनं,  
शिवागमनोत्पत्तिः, ततश्च जगतः क्षोभः, 'अयं नमः  
ऋषिभ्य उक्तवान्', 'ब्रह्मोपदेशतो लिङ्गपूजा  
शिवेन शैवं ज्ञानं प्रदत्तमृषिभ्यः' उ॥३८॥१-३९॥८०

शुकः

—द्वैपायनपुत्रः, पश्चास्य पुत्राः, कन्या कीर्तिमती नाम

पृ॥१९॥२५-२७

शुकः

—भृगुपुत्रः, हरभक्तः दैत्याचार्यः

पृ॥१९॥१७

शेषः [ = अनन्तः ]

—विष्णुरूपः पातालावस्थः, सर्वाधारः

पृ॥४४॥२६-२९

श्रीः

—क्षीरसागरमन्थनं, ततः श्रीजन्म, श्रीतत्त्वम्

पृ॥१॥२७-४०

—इन्द्रद्युम्नस्य विष्णुप्रसादतो विप्रत्वं, तस्य श्रीदेवीदर्शनं,  
श्रीकथनेन इन्द्रद्युम्नस्य विष्ण्वाराधनम्

पृ॥१॥४१-६६

—विष्णुना ब्रह्म-रुद्र-श्रियः सृष्टाः, जगन्मोहाय श्रीः विष्णुना नियो-  
जिता, ज्ञानयोगरतादीन् विहायान्यान् श्रीर्मोहयामास ।

पृ॥२॥१-२२

श्वेतः

—राजर्षिः, कालभीतं राजानं कालो वबन्ध, राज्ञा शिवस्तुतिः  
कृता, राज्ञे शिवेन वरो दत्तः

पृ॥३६॥११-३८

श्वेताश्वतरः

—शैवयोगी द्र० सुशीलः

पृ॥१४॥२३-५०

षट्कुलीयाः

—नैमिषस्थाः, शिवदर्शनापाय-विषये ब्रह्माणं प्रति जिज्ञासा,  
नैमिषमाहारम्यं च

पृ॥४३॥१-१६

संज्ञादः

—हिरण्यकशिपुपुत्रः, पृथिव्यदेहसंभूतैः सिंहैर्दत्तः

पृ॥१६॥२०-७७

सङ्कल्पः

—ब्रह्मकर्तृकाऽस्य सृष्टिः संकल्पतः

पृ॥७॥३४-३९

सङ्कल्पा

—दक्षकन्या, धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राः

पृ॥१६॥७-११

सनक्तः

—ब्रह्मणो मानसः पुत्रो, योगी

पृ॥७॥१९-२१

## सनत्कुमारः

- ब्रह्मणो मानसः पुत्रो, योगी पृ० ७१९-२१  
 —प्रह्लादसुताय विरोचनाय उपदेशो दत्तोऽनेन, विरोचनो  
 योगाभ्यासौ बभूव पृ० १७१-११

## सनन्दनः

- ब्रह्मणो मानसः पुत्रो, योगी पृ० ७१९-२१

## सनातनः

- ब्रह्मणो मानसः पुत्रो, योगी पृ० ७१९-२१

## सन्ततिः

- ऋतुपत्नी; बालखिल्यजननी, पृ० १३११  
 पृ० ८१७-२०

## सम्मृतिः

- मरीचिपत्नी द्र० मरीचिः पृ० १३४-५; पृ० ८१७-२०

## सवनः

- प्रियव्रतपुत्रः, पुष्कराधिपतिः पृ० ४०६-१३  
 —अस्य वर्षाधिपतयः पुत्राः पृ० ४०६१४-१५

## साध्या

- इक्षकन्या धर्मपत्नी, सर्वधर्मपत्नीनां पुत्राः पृ० १६१७-११

## सीता

- रामपत्नी द्र० अमिनः पृ० ३४११२-१४१

## सुमन्तुः

- व्यासशिष्यः, अथर्ववेद-प्रवक्ता पृ० ५२१२-१५

## सुरभिः

- इक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, गोमहिषजननी पृ० १८१२

## सुरसा

- इक्षकन्या, कश्यपपत्नी, अस्याः पुत्राः सर्पाः पृ० १८१९

## सुरशीलः

- शिखण्डिपुत्रः, नृपः, श्वेताश्वतरोऽस्मै पशुपाशविमोचनं  
 नै दत्तवान्, अर्थं पाशुपतोऽभवत् पृ० १४१२३-५०

## सूतः

- नैमिषीयैः ऋषिभिः सह सूतस्य पुराणविषयकः संवादः,  
तदनन्तरं सूतवाक्यारम्भः पृ० ११२-८
- वेनपुत्र-पृथुयज्ञे जातः, पौराणिकः, एतदन्वयजाताः  
सूता वेदवर्जिताः पृ० १४१२-१६
- व्यासेनायम् इतिहासपुराणे नियुक्तः, व्यासस्य पञ्चमः शिष्यः पृ० १२१२-१५

## सोमः

- दाक्षायणीनां सप्तविंशतिकन्यानां पतिः पृ० १८१७; पृ० १६१५-६

## सृष्टिः

- अक्षिरसः पत्नी द्र० अङ्गिराः पृ० १३८-९

## स्वधा

- पितृणां पत्नी, तदपत्यम् पृ० ८१७-२०; पृ० १३१९-२२

## स्वायम्भुवमनुः

- एतत्-पुत्रौ प्रियव्रतोत्तानपादौ, उत्तानपादपुत्रो ध्रुवः पृ० १४११-२
- धर्मप्रवक्ता, तद्वचनानुसारेण अन्ये सुनयोऽपि धर्मप्रवक्तारः पृ० १२०६५-२६६
- स्वायम्भुवमनुपुत्रप्रियव्रत-वंशः पृ० ४०११-४८
- धर्मप्रवक्ता पृ० १२३७
- स्वायम्भुवमनुतः दक्षपर्यन्तो वंशः पृ० १४१६५

## स्वाहा

- अग्निपत्नी, तदपत्यम् { पृ० ८१७-२०  
{ पृ० १३१९४-१८

## हव्यः [ पाठा० भव्यः ]

- प्रियव्रतपुत्रः, शाकद्वीपाधिपतिः पृ० ४०१६-१३
- अस्य वर्षाधिपतयः पुत्राः पृ० ४०१६-१९

## हिंसा

- अधर्मपत्नी, अधर्महिंसातो निकृत्यादीनां जन्म, [पृ० ८१५ अपि द्र०] पृ० ८२५-२९
- ब्रह्मतोऽधर्महिंसाजन्म पृ० ८१५-५

## हिमवान्

- मेनापतिः, तदपत्यानि पृ० १३१९-२२
- देव्याः पार्वतीरूपेण जन्म, हिमालयं प्रत्युपदेशः,  
हिमवत्कृता देवी-स्तुतिः पृ० १२४०-३२

## हिरण्यकशिपुः

—दितिजः, प्रह्लादसंहादानुहादहादाः पुत्राः, विष्णुजात-पुरुषेण  
नरसिंहेनैषां युद्धं, नरसिंहेनास्य वधः कृतः पृ० १६।२०-७७

## हिरण्याक्षः

—दितिपुत्रः, हिरण्यकशिपोरनुजः ( पृ० १६।२०-२१ ) ; अनेन  
वेदोऽपहृतः, चराहकर्तुकोऽस्य वधः पृ० १६।७७-८४

## ह्लादः

—हिरण्यकशिपुपुत्रः, नृसिंहेण सहास्य युद्धम् पृ० १६।२०-७७

## दशमः खण्डः—निर्वचन-लक्षण-गणना-मत-वर्णनादयः

## (१) विभागः—निर्वचनम् [ विशिष्टम् ]

अजः	पृ० ४।५९
अविमुक्तः	पृ० ३१।५७
आदित्यः	पृ० ४३।१०
आदिदेवः	पृ० ४।५९
ईश्वरः	पृ० ४।६१
ऋषिः	पृ० ४।६१
एकः <sup>१</sup>	पृ० ४।१८
ओम्	पृ० ४।६३
तारकः	पृ० ४।६५
नारायणः	{ पृ० ४।६२; पृ० ६।५
नैमिषः	उ० ४३।८-९
परमेश्वरः	पृ० ४।६०
प्रजापतिः	पृ० ४।५९
प्रवहः	पृ० ४३।३१
ब्रह्मा	पृ० ४।६०

(१) एकादिब्रह्मनाम्नां लक्षणं न तु निर्वचनमिति स्पष्टं प्रतीयते ।

July, 1961]

कूर्मपुराण-विषयसूची

393

भगवान्	पृ० ४१६३
महादेवः	पृ० ४१६०
रुद्रः	पृ० १०१२४
रोमहर्षणः	पृ० ११४
विभुः	पृ० ४१६३
विष्णुः	पृ० ४१६३
शिवः	पृ० ४१६४
सर्वज्ञः	पृ० ४१६४
स्वयम्भूः	पृ० ४१६२
हरः	पृ० ४१६३
हरिः	पृ० ४१६१

(२) विभागः—लक्षणम् [ विशिष्टपदार्थानाम् ]

अहिंसा	उ० १११४
क्षमा	उ० १५१३०
ज्ञानम्	उ० १५१३६
दमः	उ० १५१३५
दया	उ० १५१३१
ध्यानम्	उ० १११३६-४०
पुराणम्	पृ० १११२
प्रतिसञ्चरः ( चतुर्धा )	उ० ४५१६-१०
प्राणायामः	उ० १११३०
ब्राह्मणः	उ० १५१२७
भूलोकः	पृ० ४११३
योगाङ्गानि ( अहिंसादीनि )	उ० १११४-६७
विज्ञानम्	उ० १५१३२-३१
विद्याः	उ० १५१३१
शमः	उ० १५१३१

सत्यम्

उ०११६, उ०१५१४

समाधिः

उ०११४१-४२

## (३) विभागः—गणना [ विशिष्टपदार्थानाम् ]

अङ्गानि [ महेश्वरस्य ] ( षट् )	उ०८१३
अध्याप्या द्विजातयः ( षट् )	उ०१४११
अन्नम् [ वर्ज्यान्नम् ] ( षट् )	उ०१७४
आश्रमः ( अष्टविधः )	पू०२१७६-८४
गन्धर्वाः ( द्वादश )	पू०४२१२-१३
गुणाः ( त्रयः )	उ०७२६
गृही ( द्विविधः )	उ०२५१२
छन्दांसि ( सप्त )	पू०४११३२-३३
तत्त्वानि ( चतुर्विंशतिः )	उ०७२१-२५
दानम् ( त्रिविधम् )	उ०२६४
द्वीपाः ( सप्त )	पू०४५१२
पङ्क्तिविभेदकानि ( षट् )	उ०१६३१-३२
प्रकृतिविकाराः ( अष्ट )	उ०७२२
ब्रह्मपुत्राः ( नव )	पू०२१२३-२४
ब्रह्मबन्धवः ( षड् )	उ०११२६-२८
भक्ष्याः ( पञ्च )	उ०१७४
भावना ( त्रिविधा )	पू०११८९-९०
महायज्ञाः ( पञ्च )	उ०१८१९९-१६१
मान्यस्थानानि ( पञ्च )	उ०१२४९-५०
यज्ञाः ( पञ्च )	उ०१८१००
योगः ( द्विविधः )	उ०१११५
रत्नम् [ सूर्यस्य ] ( सप्त )	पू०४३१२-४
कसवः ( अष्टौ )	पू०१६१२-१३



वाचकाः ( त्रयः )	उ।११।२३
वायुनेमयः ( सप्त )	पू।४१।६-७
विद्याः ( चतुर्दश )	पू।१२।२७०-२७१
विप्राः ( सप्त )	उ।३०।६
श्राद्धः ( पञ्चविधः )	उ।२०।२५-२६
संन्यासी ( त्रिविधः ) [ विविधस्थले त्रिविधेतिपाठः सम्यक् ]	उ।२८।५
सागराः ( सप्त )	पू।४५।४
सूक्ष्माणि ( सप्त )	उ।२।१४
सूर्याः ( द्वादश )	पू।४२।२-३
स्तानम् ( षड्विधम् )	उ।१८।१२

### (४) विभागः—वर्णनम्

उपमन्यु—आश्रमः	पू।२५।३-१२
नारायण—पुरम्	पू।४६।५०-६३
शिवः	पू।२५।४९-५९

### (५) विभागः—मत-श्लोक-वर्चांसि [ विशिष्टानि ]

मनुमतम् [ स्वायंभुवमनु—प्रजापतिपदे अपि ]

—धर्मप्रवक्ता	पू।२।३७
—सामासिकधर्मविषयकम्	पू।२।६८
—स्वायंभुवो मनुधर्मोक्तवान्	पू।१२।२६५
—आत्मायसिद्धकर्मयोगः	उ।१२।२
—मधुपर्कादिदोषविषयकम्	उ।१३।२९
—गुरुत्यागहेतुः	उ।१४।२५
—अनध्यायसंबन्धि	उ।१४।६५
—अदत्तादानसंबन्धि	उ।१६।७
—पञ्चनखभक्षणविषयकम्	उ।१७।३४-३५
—पञ्चविधं श्राद्धम्	उ।२०।२५-२६

—अशौचविषयकम्	उ॥२३॥९
—यतिपात्रविषयकम्	उ॥२६॥९
—व्यासगीताविषयः मनुप्रोक्तः	उ॥३४॥१४४

### (६) विभागः—विविधम्

क्षीरसमुद्रमन्थनम्	पृ॥१॥२७
सुदर्शनचक्रम्	पृ॥२२॥६२-६६

REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE PURĀṆA  
DEPARTMENT (1960-51)

By

ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

[ सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागे गतवर्षाद् एतावत्काल-  
पर्यन्तं यावत् कार्यं सम्पादितं, तस्य विवरणमत्र प्रकाशयते । महत्स्यपुराणस्य  
पाठसमीक्षात्मकं कार्यं मद्रासनगरे डा० वे० राधवनमहोदयैः क्रियते,  
वामनपुराणस्य च कोशानां पाठसंवादः रामनगरपुराणविभागे प्रचलति,  
पाठसंवादानन्तरमस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंस्करणकार्यं डा० वासुदेवशरण  
अग्रवालमहोदयेन करिष्यते । वामनपुराणस्य श्लोकसूचीकार्यं संपूर्णम् ।  
पुराणविषयसूचीकार्यं पूर्ववत् प्रचलति, तस्य विस्तृतं विवरणमत्र दीयते ।  
पूर्वस्मिन्नङ्के वामनपुराणस्य विषयसूची प्रकाशिता, अस्मिन्नङ्के च कूर्मपुराणस्य ।  
'वेदव्यास-गवेषणामन्दिर'स्य पञ्जीकरणार्थं विभिन्नविश्वविद्यालयैः सह तस्य  
सम्बन्धस्थापनार्थं च सम्यक् प्रयतनं प्रचलति । महर्षेयस्य जीवनवृत्तस्य तस्य  
रचनानां च संबन्धे न्यासघोषितप्रतियोगितानिबन्धलेखनार्थं विद्वांसः प्रार्थ्यन्ते ।  
इदमाशास्यते यद् एतादृशाः निबन्धाः प्रचुरसंख्यायां प्राप्स्यन्ते । ]

Since the publication of the last report of the work of the Purāṇa Department which appeared in the previous issue of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin (Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 134-40), the following further work has been done in connection with the preparing of the critical editions of the Purāṇas, the compiling of the Purāṇic Concordance, and the publication of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin.

CRITICAL EDITIONS :

1. *Matsya Purāṇa*—As already mentioned in the last report, the critical edition of the Matsya Purāṇa is being prepared by Dr. V. Raghavan with the help of some Pandits and Assistants at Madras on the basis of thirty manuscripts collated so far, the details of which have already been given in the previous reports published in the 'Purāṇa' (Vol. I, No. 1 ; Vol. III, No. 1). The Collation work of the Matsya Purāṇa manuscripts has

almost been completed. Besides the thirty manuscripts mentioned above, the collation of the four manuscripts of the Matsya Purāṇa, deposited in the Oriental Research Institute of Mysore, has been done at Mysore. The following work on the Matsya Purāṇa has also been done at Madras under the guidance of Dr. V. Raghavan :

(i) About 3,000 verses of the Matsya Purāṇa, quoted in the following Smṛti-Nibandhas have been identified and collated with the ĀSS. text :

Name of the Nibandha.	Approximate No. of verses
(1) Kṛtya-Kalpataru (five more Volumes)	1800
(2) Adbhutasāgara	225
(3) Manusmṛti	155
(4) Śāvasūtakāśauca	2
(5) Vidhāna Pārijāta (Parts I & II)	195
(6) Rājadharmā Kaustubha	285
(7) Kāla-tattva-vivecana (Part I)	8
(8) Kālaviveka	27
Total	2697

Those verses which are quoted in the Nibandha-Granthas, but are not found in the ĀSS., have been copied separately.

(ii) Metrical irregularities in the non-Anuṣṭubh verses of the Matsya Purāṇa have been examined. The results of the examination have already been published in the 'Purāṇa' (Vol. II, and Vol III No. 1).

(iii) Indices of the following topics of the Matsya Purāṇa have been prepared :—

(a) Proper names, (b) Mountains, (c) Rivers (d) Geographical places, (e) Flora, (f) Birds and Beasts, (g) Vratas, and (h) Mahādānas.

(iv) A verse to verse comparison of the Grantha Manuscript and the Tamil translation of the Matsya Purāṇa has been made,

2. *Vāmana Purāṇa*—The work of preparing its critical edition has been entrusted to Dr. Vasudeva Sharan Agrawala. Fifteen manuscripts of the Vāmana Purāṇa have been procured from various places of India and abroad up till now, the details of which have already appeared in the previous issue of the 'Purāṇa' (Vol. III, No. 1, pp. 135, 136). Besides those mentioned there, a few more manuscripts of the Vāmana Purāṇa have also been procured now, among them the microfilm of a Devanāgarī manuscript (No. 8. B. 5, on p 155 a of the Catalogue) from the Adyar Library, Madras, deserves special mention, for it mostly agrees with the Bengali manuscript of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. 353-71-B-3 ; No. 3989 of H. P. Shastri's Catalogue, V) in the omission of the Adhyāyas of the Vāmana Purāṇa (Veṅk. ed.).

As regards the collation of the Vāmana Purāṇa manuscripts, eight manuscripts, including the Telugu Ms. (No. D 2663) of the Government Oriental Manuscripts-Library, Madras, have been collated up till now. The Telugu Ms. has been collated at Madras by the Asstt. Pandits of Dr. V. Raghavan, and the collation sheets have been received from there at Ramnagar Purāṇa-Office.

Further, a detailed chart of all the chapter-colophons of the Mss. of the Vāmana Purāṇa, collated or consulted so far, has been prepared for a comparative study of the number and the arrangement of the Adhyāyas of the Vāmana Purāṇa. Many Adhyāyas of the Veṅkatesvara edition are found omitted uniformly in several reliable Mss. belonging to different times and places. Some Mss. have also an arrangement of the Adhyāyas different from that of the Veṅk. ed. Again, according to the information supplied by Dr. V. Raghavan who is compiling the New Catalogus Catalogorum in the Madras University, the description of some manuscripts given in their respective catalogues gives a clue to an old Vāmana Purāṇa consisting of Pūrvabhāga and Uttarabhāga. The learned article of Dr. V. Raghavan containing this and other important information will be published in the next issue of 'Purāṇa'.

3. *Other Purāṇas*—With a view to prepare, in future, the critical editions of some more Purāṇas, a few manuscripts of the *Brahma Purāṇa* have been already collated as mentioned in the previous review of the work of the Purāṇa Department. With the same object in view, the Ādhāra Pāṭha of the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* from its Veṅkateśvara Press edition has been written and compared for the purpose of collating its manuscripts. And in order to search its quotation in the Nibandha-Granthas of the Dharma-Śāstra, an alphabetical index of its Śloka-pādas is under preparation. A Sāradā manuscript of the *Viṣṇu-dharmottara Purāṇa* has also been partly collated.

#### PURĀṆA-CONCORDANCE.

The importance of a Subject-Concordance of the Purāṇas has already been discussed previously in 'Purāṇa' Vol III, No. 1. The Purāṇa-Concordance as planned by the All-India Kashiraj Trust is being compiled as usual by Pt. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya with two Assistants on the basis of a large number of slips prepared for the purpose. In the last issue of the 'Purāṇa', the *Vāmana-Purāṇa-Concordance* was published for eliciting the opinions of the scholars. The Concordance-work of the *Kūma Purāṇa* has also been completed, and is now being published in the present issue of this Bulletin. Besides, the following Concordance-work has also been done :—

The Concordance-work of the *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* is almost completed, and may be published in the next issue of the 'Purāṇa'. The work of preparing the slips of the *Matsya* and the *Mārkandeeya* has also been completed. The slips of the major subjects of the *Brahma*, *Līṅga*, *Agni* and *Garuḍa* have also been prepared, and now the slips of their minor and secondary subjects are being prepared. The work of preparing the slips of the major subjects of the *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Nāradya*, *Devi-Bhāgavata* and *Brahmavaivarta* has also been completed. The work of preparing the slips of the major subjects of the *Padma* and the *Bhaviṣya* is still going on. The

Bhāgavata, Śaiṣya, Viṣṇu-dharmottara and Skanda have not yet been taken up.

### THE 'PURĀṆA' BULLETIN

From the letters of appreciations received from some eminent Indologists of India and foreign countries, and also from the Reviews of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin appeared in some Papers and Indological Journals both of India and the West, it appears that this Bulletin has fulfilled a long felt want in the sphere of Indological study and research. The 'PURĀṆA' is still receiving wide appreciation from Indologists and other Oriental scholars all over the world. Sanskrit Pandits of the traditional learning have also begun to feel an urge for applying themselves to the study of the critical aspect of the Purāṇas, and so they are also heartily cooperating with the 'Purāṇa' Journal. As this Journal aims at presenting and encouraging a scientific study of one special and important branch (Purāṇa) of Indology, it has also attracted the attention of scholars of ancient Indian culture and of comparative history of religions. Many eminent Indian and foreign scholars have appreciated, in their letters, the high standard and the usefulness of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin. We are still deprived of the scholarly contributions and other necessary help for the Bulletin from Dr. V.S. Agiawala who has not yet fully recouped his health, and is still weak. We hope he will soon be in a position to render his valuable help to the Bulletin in every possible way.

### PURĀṆA-RECITATIONS AND DISCOURSES

The complete recitations (*pārāyaṇa*) of the Purāṇas and the discourses thereon, are arranged every year at Ramnagar according to a fixed plan by His Highness, the Kāśīnareśa. To keep up the old tradition of *Purāṇa-pāṭha* and *Purāṇa-pravacana*, the Purāṇa chosen for the purpose is recited in the morning, and the discourses on it are given in the evening daily by a learned Paṇḍita who has made a special study of that particular Purāṇa.

According to this plan, the *pārāyaṇa* and the *pravāsaṇa* of a Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa are held in the Padmanābha-temple during the bright half of the month of Kārtika (Oct.-Nov.), of a Śākta Purāṇa in the Duigā-temple during the bright half of the month of Māgha (January), of a Śaiva Purāṇa in the Śiva-temple during the dark half of the month of Phālguna (Feb.), of a work on the Rāma-charita in the Rāma-temple during the bright half of the month of Chaitra, and of an Āgama or Tantra in the Bālā Tripuṇa-Sundarī-temple during the bright half of the month of Āshāḍha (July). The Purāṇas chosen are taken up during their respective periods, as mentioned above, for two consecutive years. At the end of the completion of the recitation and the discourses, the learned scholar is requested to submit a summary of his Purāṇa-discourses in Sanskrit. The summary of the discourses on the Kūrma-Purāṇa is published in the present issue of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin as the first of its series.

During the last two years, the Purāṇas taken up for recitations and discourses were Varāha, Kālikā, Kūrma, Padma, and the Mudgala Purāṇa (a work on Āgama or Jāntṛa?). The Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa, the Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa and the Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha were also recited and the learned discourses on them were given as usual.

#### VEDA-PĀRĀYAṆA FROM MEMORY

Recitations (*Pārāyaṇa*) of Veda from memory are arranged twice a year—on the Vāsanta Pañchamī and the Vyāsa Pūrnimā occasions during the whole of the bright fortnight—with an annual donation of Rs. 1100 by Śrī Kāśinareśa Mahārāja Vibhūti Narayan Singh. The recitations are held in the Vyāsa temple of the Ramnagar Fort under the guidance and the supervision of Padmabhūṣaṇa Pt Rājesvara Śāstrī Dāvida, Principal of the Sāṅga Veda Vidyālaya, Varanasi. The learned Paṇḍita chosen for these recitations has to recite the whole of the Saṁhitā, together with all the Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads belonging to the Veda chosen for the recitation. On the comple-



tion of the *Pārāyaṇa* the reciter is awarded a 'Gold-Kaṅkana' and a certificate of appreciation by His Highness, besides the usual dakṣiṇā.

During the last three years the Ṛgveda and the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda with all their Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads have each been recited twice. At present, on this Vyāsa Pūrṇimā occasion, the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda is being recited by Pt. Subrahmaṇya Ghanapāthī of the Tiruchinapalli District, Madras.

#### VYĀSA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The necessary information about the Institute has already been given in the previous issue of the 'Purāṇa'. Efforts are now being made for its early registration and its affiliation with various Universities. The Institute will provide every possible facility for Pūrāṇic study and research.

#### COMPETITION-ESSAYS ON VYĀSA

The All-India Kashiraj Trust has already announced a cash-prize of Rs. 500 yearly for a Competition-Essay on the 'Life and Works of Mahārṣi Vyāsa', on the last cover page of the 'Purāṇa', Vol. II, Nos 1-2. But no Essay has come forth till now. Scholars are requested to take interest in these Essays, so that light may be thrown on this important subject.

#### ILLUSTRATIONS OF MAHARṢI VYĀSA

The All-India Kashiraj Trust has also been trying to collect important illustrations of Mahārṣi Vyāsa, and publish them one by one in the Vyāsa Pūrṇima issues of the 'Purāṇa'. One such illustration has already been published on the frontispiece of 'Purāṇa' Vol. II. Another is now being published on the frontispiece of the present issue, and its source and description is also being given here. Scholars are requested to send important portraits of Vyāsa, which they may come across in course of their study and research, to the Kashiraj Trust.

---

## प्रथमपृष्ठसंलग्नचित्रम्

प्रथमपृष्ठसम्मुखे संलग्नं महर्षेर्व्यासस्य चित्रमिदं श्रीकाशीनरेशस्य रामनगर-  
दुर्गस्थे देवीमन्दिरे भित्तौ अङ्कितात् श्रीव्यासचित्राभिर्मितमालोकचित्रम् ।  
रामनगरदुर्गस्थे व्यासमन्दिरेऽपि श्रीव्यासस्य तैलचित्रमेकं सुरक्षितं वर्त्तते । तत्तु  
देवोमन्दिरभित्तौ लिखितस्य व्यासचित्रस्य आदर्शः प्रतीयते । व्यासमन्दिरस्थेदं  
चित्रं १९११ विक्रमाब्दे श्रीकाशिराजस्य दल्लुलालनाम्ना चित्रकारेण निर्मायि ।

महर्षेर्व्यासस्येदं चित्रं स्व० काशिनरेश-महाराज-ईश्वरीप्रसादनारायणसिंहानां  
गुरुणा काष्ठजिह्वोपनामकेन श्रीदेवतीर्थस्वामिना रचितेषु हिन्दीगेय‘पदेषु’ समुपनिबद्धं  
श्रीव्यासवर्णनमनुसरतीति प्रतीयते । श्रीदेवतीर्थस्वामी महान् विद्वान्, यतिप्रवरः  
परमभक्तः, संगीतशास्त्रवेत्ता सुकविश्चासीत् । विविधविषयका ग्रन्था देववाण्यामपि  
तेन रचिताः । सार्धसहस्राधिकानां हिन्दी-गेय‘पदानां’ स रचयिताऽऽसीत् ।  
तस्य सर्वाप्यपि गेय‘पदानि’ शास्त्रीयरागानुसारीणि । प्रसिद्धग्रन्थसूची-निर्मातुः  
आफ्फ्रेस्टनाम्नो विदुषो लेखानुसारेण श्रीदेवतीर्थस्वामी १८५५ ख्रीस्ताब्दे  
यशःशेषतां प्राप ।

संलग्नव्यासचित्रस्य वर्णनं तत्र सम्मुखे प्रदत्ते हिन्दीपद्यानां पङ्क्तिचतुष्टये  
वर्त्तते । आसां पङ्क्तीनामाद्यं पङ्क्तिद्वयं श्रीदेवतीर्थस्वामिरचितात् “इयामसुधा”  
ग्रन्थात्, अन्तिमं च पङ्क्तिद्वयं तस्य “काशीबिन्दु”ग्रन्थात् उद्धृतम् ।

व्यासचित्रमवृत्तशरीरस्य श्रीव्यासस्येदं वर्णनं विलक्षणं प्रतिभाति, पुराणादिषु  
प्राचीनग्रन्थेषु वर्णनस्यास्य मूलं मृग्यं सुधीभिरिति निवेद्यते ।

## THE FRONTISPIECE

The frontispiece having the illustration of Mahārṣi Vyāsa has been prepared from a photograph of a wall-painting of the Maharaja's Devī-temple, Ramnagar Fort, Varanasi. An oil-painting of Vyāsa-Devn is preserved in the Vyāsa-temple, Ramnagar Fort, which seems to be the proto-type of this illustration, and is dated Vikrama Samvat 1911 (A. D. 1854). This oil-painting was made by the Court-painter, Dattu Lal.

The details of this illustration seem to tally with the description given in the Hindi songs of Śrī Devatīrtha alias Kāṣṭhājihvā Svāmī. The Author was the Guru of His Late Highness Maharaja Ishwari Prasad Narain Singh, and was a well-known Sanyasin-Saint and a renowned scholar of his time, who has to his credit many Sanskrit works covering various subjects, and also about 1500 Hindi songs. Apart from the devotional poetry and teachings, his songs, set in classical musical rāgas, comprise many technical and intricate Śāstrik points of varied interest. He died at Varanasi in about 1855 A.D. according to Aufrecht.

The first two lines of the verses quoted here, facing the picture of Vyāsa, are taken from his "Śyāma-Sudhā". The latter two lines are from his songs describing Ramnagar (Vyāsa-Kāśī) in the "Kāśī-Vindu".

The description of Vyāsa clad in tiger-skin is significant ; it has not yet been possible to trace its source in the Purāṇas. Scholars are requested to throw light on the ancient source of this description.



## पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. IV, No. 1 ]

वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्कः

[ 9 Feb., 1962

### लेखसूची—CONTENTS

	Pages
अम्बुवीचिकृतं सरस्वती-स्तोत्रम्	1—2
Studies in Purāṇic History, Genealogies and Chronology in Modern Times (आधुनिकयुगे पौराणिकेतिहासस्य पुराणवंशावलीनां पुराणवृत्त-कालक्रमस्य चाध्ययनम्)	3—22
By Prof D. R. Manikud ; Gangajala Vidya-peeth, P. O. Aliabada (Gujarat).	
Genealogy of the Solar Dynasty in the Purāṇas and the Rāmāyaṇa : A Critical Study [पुराणेषु रामायणे च सूर्यवंशीयराज्ञां वंशावली तस्या आलोचनात्मकमध्ययनं च]	22—33
By Dr. A. D. Pusalker, M.A., LL.B., Ph.D., Director, Post-Graduate and Research Dept., BORI, Poona 4.	
धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणानां वेदोपबृंहणत्वम् [Amplification of the Vedas by the Dharmaśāstra, Itihāsa and Purāṇas].	34—54
(पं. के० वि० नीलमेघाचार्य, हनुमानघाट, काशी)	
Conception of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas पुराणेषु सरस्वतीविषयिका दृष्टिः]	55—95
By Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, M.A.; i/c. Purāṇa Deptt, A. I. Kashiraj Trust.	
The Problem of Gaṇeśa in the Purāṇas [पुराणवर्णितगणेशविषयको विमर्शः]	96—102
By Dr. Juan Roger Riviere ; Professor of Indology, University of Madrid (Spain)	

भगवती लक्ष्मी: [Goddess Lakṣmī] 103-111

(डा० नरेन्द्रनाथ शर्मा चौधुरी, संस्कृतविभागाध्यक्ष, दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय)

The Geographical Text of the Purāṇas : A Further Critical Study [पुराणभुवनकोशग्रन्थस्य समालोचनात्मकमध्ययनम्] 112-145

By *Dr. C. A. Lewis* ; 22, Dunkirk Road, Fishponds, Bristol, England.

The Four-fold Division of the Heavenly River in the Purāṇas [पुराणेषु देवन्द्याश्चतुर्धा विभागः] 146-153

By *Dr. B. H. Kapadia* ; Prof. Sardar Vallabhai Vidyāpeeth, Vallabhanagar (Gujarat)

पद्मपुराणसुभाषितानि [Wise Sayings from the Padma-Purāṇa] 154-157

(Compiled by *Shri Rāmashankar Bhattacharya* Shivala Bhavana, Varanasi)

The Old-Javanese Agastya-Parva [प्राचीनजावादेशीयः 'अगस्त्यपर्व' नामको ग्रन्थः] 158-175

By *Dr. J. Gonda* ; van Hogendorpstraat 13, Utrecht (Netherlands)

Paṣkara-Māhātmya or the so-called Padma-Purāṇa Samuccaya ['पुष्करमाहात्म्यम्' 'पद्मपुराणसमुच्चयो' वा नामको ग्रन्थः] 176-181

By *Prof. Asoke Chatterji*, Shastri, M. A.; Govt. Sanskrit College, Calcutta.

प्राचीनग्रन्थेषु पुराणनिर्देशाः ('Purāṇa' references in ancient Works) 182-183

(Compiled by *Shri R. S. Bhattacharya*)

- The Vāmana-Purāṇa [ वामनपुराणम् ] 184-192  
By *Dr. V. Raghavan*, M. A., Ph.D.; Prof.  
University of Madras
- On Some Readings of the Matsya-Purāṇa  
[मत्स्यपुराणस्य केषांचिन् पाठाणां विषये विचारः] 193-196  
By *Dr. Nilmaḍḍhav Sen*, Deccan College  
Research Institute, Poona-6.
- The Legend of Cīrakārīn in the Skānda Mahā-  
purāṇa and the Mahābhārata [स्कान्दमहापुराणे महाभारते  
च चिरकारिकोपाख्यानम्] 197-214  
By *Prof. V. M. Bidekar*, M.A., Bhandarkar  
Oriental Research Institute, Poona-4
- विष्णुकृतं गणेशस्तोत्रम् -215
- Literary and Cultural Activities of the All-India  
Kashiraj Trust [सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्] 216-222
- Book-Review [पुस्तक-समीक्षा] 223-229  
By *Prof. Philippe Lavastine*. (54 rue du Four  
Paris, VI) and *A. S. Gupta* (Purāṇa Deptt.,  
Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi).





## अम्बुवीचिकृतं सरस्वतीस्तोत्रम् \*

( स्कन्दपुराण, नागरा, अ० ४६, श्लो० २२-३३, वैकटेश्वर० बंगवासी० च )

सदसद् देवि यत्किञ्चिद् बन्धमोक्षात्मकं पदम् ।  
तत्सर्वं गुप्तया व्याप्तं त्वया काष्ठं यथाग्निना ॥ २२ ॥  
सर्वस्य सिद्धिरूपेण त्वं जनस्य हृदि स्थिता ।  
वाचारूपेण जिह्वायां ज्योतीरूपेण चक्षुषि ॥ २३ ॥  
भक्तिग्राह्यासि देवेशि त्वमेका भुवनत्रये ।  
शरणागतदीनार्चपरित्राणपरायणे ॥ २४ ॥  
त्वं कीर्त्तिस्त्वं धृतिर्मेधा त्वं भक्तिस्त्वं प्रभा स्मृता ।  
त्वं निद्रा त्वं क्षुधा कीर्त्तिः सर्वभूतनिवासिनी ॥ २५ ॥  
तुष्टिः पुष्टिर्वपुःप्रीतिः स्वधा स्वाहा विभावरी ।  
रतिः प्रीतिः क्षितिर्गङ्गा सत्यं धर्मो मनस्विनी ॥ २६ ॥  
लज्जा शान्तिः स्मृतिर्दक्षा क्षमा गौरी च रोहिणी ।  
सिनीवाली कुहू राका देवमाता दितिस्तथा ॥ २७ ॥  
ब्रह्मणी विनता लक्ष्मीः कद्रुर्दक्षायणी शिवा ।  
गायत्री चोथ सावित्री कृषिर्वृष्टिः श्रुतिः कला ॥ २८ ॥  
बला नाडी तुष्टिकाष्ठा<sup>१</sup> रसना च सरस्वती ।  
यत्किञ्चित् त्रिषु लोकेषु बहुत्वाद् यन्न कीर्त्तितम् ॥ २९ ॥

\* सारस्वततीर्थमाहालयवर्णनप्रसङ्गे स्तोत्रमिदं स्कान्दे वर्तते । बलवर्धननामि  
नृपतौ संग्रामे निहते, अन्यसुतस्याभावेऽम्बुवीचिनामा तस्य बालः सुतो मूकोऽपि सन्  
मन्त्रिभी राज्ये स्थापितः । वसिष्ठवचनाच्च सोऽम्बुवीचिः सारस्वततीर्थे स्नात्वा तत्क्षणादेव  
मूकभावाद् विमुक्तः कलस्वनो जातः । सरस्वत्या एव तत्प्रभावमिति विज्ञाय भुक्तिकया स्वयमेव  
चतुर्भुजां भारतीं कृत्वा मेघे शिलाशृङ्गे च तां निवेश्य धूपमाल्यादिभिः पूजयित्वा च  
श्रद्धापूर्तमनसा तदग्रे प्रयतो भूत्वा महता स्वरेणेमां स्तुतिं चकार । (श्लो० ४-२१) ।

१. 'तुष्टिकाष्ठा' इति पाठे छन्दोदोषोऽत्र विद्यते, 'तुष्टिः' पदं च पूर्वं (२६ श्लोके)  
पठितमेव । परन्तु वेङ्कटेश्वरप्रेससंस्करणे वङ्गवासीप्रेससंस्करणे चोभयभायमेव पाठो  
वर्तते । अतो लेखकादिप्रमादजनितो अष्टपाठोऽयमित्यनुमीयते । अन्यच्च, हृदमप्यनुमातुं  
शक्यते यत् 'काष्ठा' शब्दोऽत्रासमस्तं पृथक् पदमेवासीद्, यथा कठोपनिषदि 'सा काष्ठा  
सा परा गतिः' इति । अथवा पुराणादिषु प्राचीनग्रन्थेषु छन्दोदोषस्य प्रायेणोपेक्षितत्वात्  
'तुष्टिकाष्ठा' पाठोऽपि समीचीन इति मत्वा 'तुष्टेः काष्ठा' अर्थात् 'परा तुष्टिरिति'  
व्याख्येयम् ।

इजितं नेजितं तच्च तद् रूपं ते सुरेश्वरि ।  
 गन्धर्वाः किन्नरा देवाः सिद्धविद्याधरोरगाः ॥ ३० ॥  
 यक्षगुह्यकभूताश्च दैत्या ये च विनायकाः ।  
 त्वत्प्रसादेन ते सर्वे संसिद्धिं परमां गताः ॥ ३१ ॥  
 तथान्येऽपि बहुत्वाद् ये न मया परिकीर्तिताः ।  
 आराधितास्तु कृच्छ्रेण पूजिताश्च सुविस्तरैः ॥  
 हरन्तु देवताः पापमन्ये त्वं कीर्तितापि च ॥ ३२ ॥

( आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त )

# STUDIES IN PURĀNIC HISTORY, GENEALOGIES AND CHRONOLOGY IN MODERN TIMES

BY

D. R. MANKAD

[ पुराणानां पाठसंशोधनार्थं, तेषामन्तःसाक्ष्यमाश्रित्य भारतवर्षस्य प्राचीनेतिहासस्य पुनर्निर्माणार्थं, पुराणोक्त राजवंशवर्णनान्याश्रित्य प्राचीन-राज्ञां शुद्धराजवंशावलीनां निर्माणार्थं, पुराणानां साहाय्येन पुरावृत्तानां कालक्रमावधारणार्थं च बहुभिर्विद्वद्भिरेतावत्कालपर्यन्तं कृतानां प्रयत्नानां सिंहावलोकनं विदुषा लेखकेन श्रीमानकडमहोदयेनास्मिन् लेखे क्रियते । तद्यथा —

१. पुराणानां शुद्धपाठनिर्धारणम्—अस्मिन् विषये ( १ ) आङ्गलदेशीयेन पार्जिटरमहोदयेन 'डाइनेस्टीज् आफ कलि-एज' ( 'कलि-युगराजवंशावली' ) ग्रन्थे ( १९१३ ई० ), ( २ ) जर्मनदेशीयेन किरफल महाशयेन च 'पुराणपञ्चलक्षण'ग्रन्थे ( १९२७ ) 'प्रशंसार्हं कार्यं कृतम्; ( ३ ) गार्गीसंहितोक्तस्य 'युगपुराण'स्य शुद्धपाठयुक्तानि संस्करणानि जायसवालमहोदयेन ( १९२८ ), ध्रुवमहोदयेन ( १९३० ) मानकडमहोदयेन ( १९५१ ) च सम्पादितानि; ( ४ ) काशिराजन्पास-संस्थयाऽधुना मत्स्यपुराणसम्पादनाय ( ५ ) गुजरातविद्यासभाद्वारा च भागवतपुराणसम्पादनार्थं प्रयत्नाः क्रियन्ते ।

२. पुराणानां साहाय्येन भारतेतिहासनिर्माणम्—अस्यां दिशायां सर्वश्री ( १ ) सर विलियम जोन्स ( १७९३ ई० ), ( २ ) पार्जिटर ( 'एनशियन्ट इंडियन हिस्टॉरिकल ट्रेडिशन' = 'प्राचीनभार-तीयेतिहासपरम्पराः', १९२२ ), ( ३ ) रायचौधरी ( 'पोलिटिकल हिस्ट्री आफ एनशियन्ट इंडिया' = 'प्राचीनभारतस्य राजनैतिकइतिहासः', १९२३ ), ( ४ ) सीतानाथप्रधान ( 'क्रॉनोलोजी आफ एनशियन्ट इंडिया' = 'प्राचीनभारतेतिहासस्य कालक्रमः', १९२७ ), ( ५ ) प्रसादकर ( 'इन दि वैदिक एज' = 'वैदिकयुगे', १९५२ ), ( ६ ) अल्तेकर, ( ७ ) श्रीरंगराव ( प्राचीन भारतीय परम्परा और इतिहास, १९५४ ), ( ८ ) पी० एल० भार्गव ( 'इंडिया इन दि वैदिक एज' = 'वैदिकयुगे भारतम्', १९५६ ), ( ९ ) जयचन्द्रविद्यालंकार ( 'भारतीय इतिहास की रूपरेखा' ), ( १० ) भगवद्दत्त ( 'भारतवर्ष का इतिहास' ),

( ११ ) श्रीरंगाचार्य ( 'त्रि-मुसल्मान इंडिया' = 'मुसल्मानकालात् प्राक् भारतम्' ), ( १२ ) के० पी० जायसवाल ( 'हिस्ट्री आफ इंडिया' ) ( १३ ) एस० के० पिल्लै ( 'वेदिक हिस्ट्री', १९५६ ) प्रभृतिभिर्विद्वद्भिः कार्यं कृतम् ।

३. पौराणिकराजवंशावलीनामवधारणम्—अस्मिन् काले मौर्य-शुङ्ग-काण्व-आन्ध्रवंशीयानां राज्ञां पौराणिकराजवंशावलीविषये-  
 ज्ञेयैर्विद्वद्भिर्गव्ययनं कृतम् । पुराणोक्तानामनेकेषां राज्ञां नामानि मुद्राशिलालेखादिभिरन्यैः प्रमाणीरपि समर्थितानि । जायसवालमहोदयेन भारशिवानां, बाकाटकानां, नागानां च विषयेऽध्ययनं कृत्वा मुद्रादिसामग्री-  
 साहाय्येन तेषां याथार्थ्यं प्रतिपादितम्, 'युगपुराणं' च तैरेव प्रथमं सम्पा-  
 दितम्, आन्ध्राणां (सातवाहननृपाणां) विषयेऽपि जायसवाल-मानकड-सेठना  
 प्रभृतिभिर्विद्वद्भिर्गवेषणा कृता । एवं मौर्यकालादारभ्य शुप्तकालपर्यन्तं पौरा-  
 णिकराजवंशावलीनां सम्यगध्ययनं संजातम् । मौर्यकालात्प्राक्वर्त्तिनां नन्दानां  
 प्रद्योतानां शैशुनागानां च विषयेऽपि विद्वद्भिर्गव्ययनमनुसंधानं च कृतम् ।  
 एच० सी० राय चौधरी, एस० एन० प्रधान, डी० आर० भण्डारकर-  
 प्रभृतीनां विदुषां नामान्यत्र विषये ख्यातानि । महाभारतकालात्प्राक्-  
 वर्त्तिना नृपाणां राजवंशावलीविषये श्री प्रधानेन सम्यग्गवेषणा कृता ।  
 रामपितुर्दंशरथस्य दिवोदासस्य च योगपद्यं निर्णय्य महाभारतात्प्राक् रामं  
 यावत् राजवंशावलीनां सम्यग् निर्धारणमपि तेन कृतम् । रामादारभ्य  
 कृष्णपर्यन्तं चतुर्दश, पञ्चदश वा राजकुलानि ( यादव-वीतथ्य-मगध-  
 हस्तिनापुर-पाञ्चाल-भृङ्ग-इक्ष्वाकु-कोशल-काशिप्रभृतीनि ) बभूवुरिति  
 तेन प्रतिपादितम् । श्रीमानकडमहोदयेन वैवस्वतमनोरारभ्य रामपर्यन्तं  
 सप्तपञ्चाशत् नृपाः श्रुतायुपर्यन्तं च एकसप्ततिर्नृपा बभूवुरिति प्रतिपादितम् ।  
 'पुराण' ( भाग २, अंक १-२ ) पत्रिकायां श्री रायकृष्णदासेनापि इक्ष्वाकु-  
 वंशविषये केचिदुपयोगिनो विचाराः प्रकटीकृताः । पुनश्च, मयुरिति वंशनाम,  
 मन्वन्तरं च वंशराज्यकाल इति श्रीमानकडेन प्रतिपादितम् । यद्यपि  
 प्राचीनराज्ञां पुराणोक्तः क्रमः प्रामाणिको न सिध्यति, तथापि  
 पुराणोक्तानां प्रायः सर्वेषामेव राज्ञामस्तित्वं तु सर्वथा प्रामाणिकमेव  
 सिध्यति ।

४. कालक्रमानुसारेण भारतेतिहासस्य पुनर्निर्माणम्—  
 प्राचीनभारतीय इतिहासः कालक्रमानुसारेणोत्थं विभज्यते—  
 (१) महाभारतात्प्राक् राजवंशावल्यः, (२) महाभारतादारभ्य  
 मन्दवंशपर्यन्तं राजवंशावल्यः, (३) मन्दवंशादुत्तरकालवर्त्तिन्यो राज-  
 वंशावल्यश्च । महाभारतप्राक्कालीनानां राज्ञां राज्यकालः पुराणेषु

नोक्तः, परन्तु महाभारतोत्तरकालीनानां वंशानां नृपाणां च राज्यकालः पुराणेषु कथित एव । आधुनिककाले नन्दवंशोत्तराणां राजवंशानामध्ययनं तु सम्पन्नम्, परन्तु नन्दवंशात् प्राक्पूर्वतिनां राज्ञां कालक्रमो नावधारितः । मगधसम्राट् चन्द्रगुप्तमौर्यो यवनसम्राजः सिकन्दरस्य समकालीन आसीदिति 'विलियमजोन्स' विदुषा प्रतिपादितम् । इदमेव मतमधुनाऽपि स्वीक्रियते, परन्तु केचन विद्वांसः 'सिकन्दरस्य समकालीनो गुप्तसम्राट् चन्द्रगुप्तप्रथमः आसीत्, न तु चन्द्रगुप्तमौर्यः' इति प्रतिपादयन्ति । राजतरंगिणीसम्पादकेन 'ट्रॉयर' नाम्ना विदुषा १८५८ ई० वर्षे मतमिदं प्रथमं प्रकाशितम् । तदनन्तरं च गोपाल ऐय्यर ( १९०१ ), टी० एस० नारायणशास्त्री ( १९१५ ), एम० कृष्णमाचार्य ( १९३९ ), डी० आर० मानकड ( १९५१ ) प्रभृतिभिर्विद्वद्भिरपि ट्रॉयरमतं समर्थितम् । तथापि भारतेतिहासस्य कस्मिंश्चिदधुनिकग्रन्थे इदं मतं न सन्निवेशितं नापि समालोचितमिति त्वाश्चर्यम् ।

पुराणेषु परिक्रितमारभ्यैव कालक्रम उक्तः, परिक्रितनृपात् प्रारभ्य नन्दानां राज्यकालं यावत् १५०० वर्षाणि व्यतीतानीति पुराणेषु कथितम् । १५०० स्थाने १०१५, १११५, ११५० इति कालगणनासि पाठान्तरेषु प्रोक्ता । पुनश्च, पुराणोक्तः कालक्रमः कलिपूर्वं सप्तर्षिपूर्वं मन्वन्तरं चाश्रित्य निश्चितः । आधुनिका विद्वांसस्तु कालक्रमविचारेण पुराणोक्तानां कलिवर्षादीनामुपेक्षामेव कुर्वन्ते—इति तु न समीचीनम् । महाभारता-प्राग्वर्तिनां राज्ञां राजवंशानां च कालक्रमावधारणेऽपि कैश्चिद्विद्वद्भिः किञ्चित् प्रयत्नं कृतं, तथापि बह्वन्नकरणीयमास्ते । ]

In his Presidential address delivered at the last Indian History Congress, December 1960, Dr. U. N. Ghoshal had, while surveying studies in Indian history, only this to say (p. 14) about Purāṇic studies in modern times.

"A reconstruction of the Royal genealogies and chronology of the Vedic Age based entirely or partially on the Purāṇic data has likewise been attempted by Pargiter (*Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*), S. N. Pradhan (*Chronology of Ancient India*), H. C. Raychaudhary (*Political History of Ancient India*), A. D. Pusalkar (*In the Vedic Age*), and P. L. Bhargava (*India and the Vedic Age*)."

Perhaps, Dr. Ghoshal had no time or it was out of his scope, but he has omitted to take notice of many more attempts

that have been made in Purāṇic studies. I have, therefore, chosen the subject of '*Studies in Purāṇic History, Genealogies and Chronology in modern times*'. In doing so, I shall not enter into controversies, but shall state the results obtained by various scholars about Purāṇic History etc. I shall do this under four sections :—(1) Textual Reconstruction, (2) Historical Reconstruction, (3) Genealogical Reconstruction and (4) Chronological Reconstruction.

### 1. TEXTUAL RECONSTRUCTION

1. Pargiter, in his '*Dynasties of Kali Age*' (1913), has collected Purāṇic texts concerning Kali dynasties, i. e. the dynasties starting just after the Mahābhārata war and coming upto the rise of the Guptas. His method of fixing the text has been eclectic, but he has quoted more recensions wherever he thought it necessary. He has also noted every available reading both from the printed editions and the manuscripts collected by him. This has preserved all the available evidence for us.

2. Kirfel in his '*Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*' (Bonn, 1927) did the same work as was done by Pargiter for the extended purpose of giving Purāṇic texts of the five traditional lakṣaṇas of the Purāṇas viz. Sarga, Pratisarga, Manvantara, Varṇśa, and Vamśānucarita. Whereas Pargiter had to collate from only five Purāṇas, Kirfel had to collate from about nine Purāṇas. But Kirfel's foot-note material is not as rich as Pargiter's.

All the same, these two are very able pioneering efforts in Purāṇic textual reconstruction. Kirfel also collated text on Bhāratavarṇa, but that is geography. Unfortunately this has not been followed up. Only the recently started Kashi Raj Trust gives hopes in this direction. They have undertaken a critical edition of *Matsya Purāṇa*, and Gujarat Vidyā Sabhā at Ahmedabad have started work on a critical edition of *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.

The text of the *Fuga-purāṇa*, a historical chapter from *Gārgīśaṃhitā* has been edited by K. P. Jayswal, 1928 ; K. H. Dhruva, 1930 and D. R. Mankad, 1951.

Question whether the original Purāṇas were written in Prākṛta has been discussed by Pargiter, A. B. Dhruva, Pusalkar and others.

## 2. HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION

This was first attempted by Sir William Jones in A. D. 1793, when he declared that the name of the Magadhan ruler, contemporary of Alexander was Chandragupta Maurya. Colonal Wilford took up this theme and later till the present day, this theme has been relied upon and strengthened by a number of scholars of ancient Indian History. And in this light, Purāṇic dynasties of Śaiśunāgas, Pradyotas, Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, Kāṇvas and Āndhras have been studied.

Then came Pargiter's great attempt in A. D. 1922, when he, in his '*Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*', undertook the study of traditional and historical materials available in the various Purāṇas. This he did from the very beginning of Purāṇic history—the dynasty of Svāyambhuva Manu. He has established a number of synchronisms and his contribution has been invaluable in drawing our attention particularly to the period prior to the Pradyotas and Śaiśunāgas. It is he, who for the first time, proved that Purāṇas preserve genuine historical materials, which, when used with discretion, can yield important results. Results obtained by him are well-known and I need not re-tell them here.

H. C. Raychaudhary, in his '*Political History of Ancient India*' (A. D. 1923) took up detailed studies of the Purāṇic dynasties of Śaiśunāga, Pradyota, Nanda and Maurya families. He supplemented these studies by a detailed study of Buddhistic, Jain and Brahmanic sources. His studies have been, now, recognised as standard and therefore authoritative.

Dr. Sita Nath Pradhan, in his '*Chronology of Ancient India*' (1927) took up this inquiry further and studied the Purāṇic dynasties from the period of Rāma to Kṛṣṇa in details. He also included post-Mahābhārata dynasties of Bārhadrathas,

Śaiśunāgas, Pradyotas, Nandas and Mauryas in his studies. His work is very important and shows original insight. He has been able to establish many historical synchronisms, which Pargiter could not. He has, at places, corrected Pargiter's synchronisms. His singular achievement is his study of kings Divodāsa and Nala Naiṣadha. He has unmistakably established that Divodāsa Atithigva of the Ṛgveda was the same as Divodāsa of the Purāṇas and that he was a contemporary of Daśaratha, the father of Rāma. Another important result achieved by him is that Nala Naiṣadha was the father-in-law of the Ṛgvedic Ṛṣi Mudgala, the grand-father of Divodāsa.

Puṣalkar in the *Vedic Age*, 1952, gives a connected history of Ancient India from Manu Vaivasvata to the Bhārata War and later. He has utilised the Purāṇic genealogies and has tried to reconstruct the history dynasty-wise :\* It is for the first time that pre-Bhārata history of India is thus included in a book of Indian History. In his '*Studies in Epics and Purāṇas*' (1958) he has studied the question of Śrīkṛṣṇa's historicity, which he has proved. He has also established the identity of Vedic Kuruśravaṇa with Purāṇic Kurusaṇvaraṇa. He has also surveyed Purāṇic studies in modern times.

A. S. Altekar in his Presidential address at Ancient section of the Indian History Congress (Calcutta) studied certain Purāṇic names and came to the conclusion that 'there is nothing unscientific or unhistorical in utilising the data of the Purāṇic genealogies of pre-Pāṇḍava period for reconstructing contemporary history after taking all due precautions.' He has also said that the various pre-Bhārata war dynasties mentioned in the Purāṇas are as real and historical as the Śaiśunāgas or the Mauryas or the Nandas.

Shri Rangaya Raghava, in his Hindi book '*Prācīna Bhāratiya Paramparā aur Itihāsa*' (1954) has given a detailed account of Purāṇic history under the periods which he had called Kīrāta-Deva-Asura-Yuga, Satyayuga, Tretāyuga, Dvāparayuga,

---

\* *Vedic Age*, pp. 270 ff.



Kaliyuga etc. He has utilised Purāṇic materials in great details. He has based his work on Pargiter, but has differed from him on several points. His is an attempt which takes Pargiter's researches further. His chapter on Kirāta-Deva Asura-Yuga is a noteworthy contribution.

P. L. Bhargava in his '*India in the Vedic Age*' (Lucknow 1956) has studied the Purāṇic materials in details for the purpose of reconstructing pre-Bhārata war period. He has tried to establish agreement between Vedic and Purāṇic traditions and thus has tried to establish several synchronisms which Pargiter could not and then he has tried to give the history of ancient India from Manu Vaivasvata to Bhārata War. He has tried to study the question of Āryan advent and expansion in India. His view\* that—'the story of the flood, which is undoubtedly connected with the migration of the Āryas, suggests by a reference to 'Manu's descent' on the northern mountain that the Āryas originally lived near some mountain range to the north of Saptasindhu from where they descended into the plains of Saptasindhu, being compelled by a flood. This mountain range was either the Hindukush or the north western part of the Himalayas—is the only one that a student of Purāṇas can arrive at. I myself have held this view for a long time past.†

Shri Jayachandra Vidyānākāra (*Bhāratiya Itihāsa kī Rūparchā*), Shri Bbagavaddatta (*Bhāratavarsa kī Itihāsa*), Shri Rangacharya (*Pre-Mussalman India*) have also tried to reconstruct Purāṇic History from the days of Manu Vaivasvata downwards.

K. P. Jayaswal, in his '*History of India, 150 A. D. to 350 A. D.*' studied the Vākāṭaka and Nāga dynasties.

Shri S. K. Pillai, in his '*Vedic History* (set in Chronology)', Allahabad 1959, has utilised Vedic and Purāṇic materials and has tried to trace historical details of the Rṣis and Kings that ruled in Vedic Age.

---

\* India in the Vedic Age, p. 26.

† He seems to be ignorant of the views of S. N. Pradhan and even Raychowdhary. He is also unaware of the 'Purāṇic Chronology.'

## 3. GENEALOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION

Purāṇic genealogies of the Maurya, Śuṅgas, Kāṇva and Āndhīa dynasties have been studied by a number of scholars in modern times and their results are, now, commonly accepted. These studies have shown that out of 9 or 10 Purāṇic names of the Mauryas, those of Chandragupta, Bindusāra, Aśoka, Samprati, Śāliśuka are corroborated by other evidences. Similarly, out of ten Purāṇic names of Śuṅgas, those of Puṣyamitra, Agnimitra, Vasumitra and Bhāgabhadra are corroborated by other evidences. So also out of the Purāṇic names of the Kāṇvas and Āndhīas, some are corroborated and others are not.

K. P. Jayaswal<sup>1</sup> made a good study of the Bhānāsīvas, Vākātakas and Nāgas and he established with the help of numismatic and other materials that these were real dynasties that actually ruled. Purāṇas name certain kings of these dynasties and he proved their historicity. He also ventured identifications of certain Purāṇic names, like Viśvasphūji, Kāṇa, Pravīra with certain king-names from other sources. In this connection, I have postulated<sup>2</sup> that the Purāṇic Viśvasphūrji (with various spellings) is the same as Samudragupta.

Jayaswal, with the help of the *Yuga Purāṇa* which he edited for the first time, showed that Śāliśuka of the Purāṇic Maurya dynasty was a real king and that Indo-greek rule of Demetrius and others was proved by this small Purāṇa. The present writer also edited<sup>3</sup> *Yuga Purāṇa*, with the help of a fresh Ms and showed the following :—

“It will be seen that according to this Purāṇa, following is the sequence of events: (1) Śāliśuka i.e. the Mauryas. (2) After the Mauryas, at Śāketa ruled seven kings in succession and at Magadha ruled, at first, the five allied governors, then came anarchy, then a Śaka king and then the four kings

1. *History of India from 150 A. D. to 350 A. D.* (1935) Chapters 2-4.

<sup>2</sup>Purāṇic Chronology (= PC) pp. 268 ff.

<sup>3</sup>*Yuga Purana* edited by D. R. Mankad, Vallabhvidyanagar, 1951.

Amlāṭa and others. (3) Then came Puṣyamitru Śuṅga, who replaced, at Sāketa, the rule of the seven kings and at Magadha, the dynasty of Amlāṭa. (4) Then ruled three more Śuṅga kings. (5) Then a king ruled for 10 years. (6) And lastly, the Śakas overran the whole land.

This means that the Śuṅgas did not immediately follow the Mauryas, but between them there was a gap caused by foreign rule and anarchy. The evidence of the *Yuga-Purāṇa* makes it clear that there was a period at Magadha between the Mauryas and the Śuṅgas, during which no indigenous independent native king ruled there. In other words, it was a period of foreign rule and of disorder.

Similarly, if this Purāṇa is to be believed, the Kāpyas did not follow the Śuṅgas immediately, but soon after the Śuṅgas, the Śakas overran the Northern India."

There are detailed studies made by several scholars about the Andhras i. e. the Śātavahanas

Jayaswal postulated<sup>1</sup> that Candāsena of the play Kaumudī-mahotsava was the same as Chandragupta I of the Gupta dynasty and in my opinion this hypothesis of Jayaswal has never been really disproved. It has been supported by me,<sup>2</sup> Dasharatha Sharma,<sup>3</sup> Sethna<sup>4</sup> and others.

Thus the Purāṇic genealogies from the Mauryas to the Guptas have been studied well.

Then we take up the pre-Mauryan period of the Nandas, the Pradyotas, the Śaiśunāgas.

H. C. Raychowdhary has established<sup>5</sup> that Purāṇic Pradyota and Śaiśunāga dynasties were not lineal but were collateral, that the Purāṇic Śaiśunāga dynasty was a composite dynasty, that this dynasty really started with Bimbisāra and

---

1. History of India pp. 118-4 ; 116-18.

2. PC. pp. 259 ff.

3. IHQ

4. Mother India, Aug. 1956 ff.

5. Political History of Ancient India, 1950 pp. 115-6 ; 222-3.

not with Śiśunāga, that the Bimbisāra family was called Haiyaṅkakula, that Bimbisāra and his successors Ajātaśatru, Udāyi, Anuruddha Muṇḍā and Nāga Dāsaka (same as Darśaka) ruled in Magadha and that Śiśunāga's successor Puṇḍik Kākavarṇa was the same as Kālāśoka of the Ceylonese chronicles.

S. N. Pradhan carried these studies further and showed<sup>1</sup> that the first two names of the Purāṇic Śaiśunāga genealogy viz. Śiśunāga and Kākavarṇa were the same as the last two names of this dynasty viz. Nandivardhana and Mahānandi and that Śiśunāga of this dynasty, Viśākkhayūpa of the Pradyota dynasty, Sumitra of the Aikṣvāka dynasty and Kṣemaka of the Aila dynasty were all at the same step and therefore contemporaries.

To this I have added<sup>2</sup> that the Purāṇic Kalki, who started the new Kṛta Age and who was later taken as an Avatāra was a contemporary of these four kings viz. Śiśunāga, Viśākkhayūpa, Sumitra and Kṣemeka.

About the Nandas, D. R. Bhandarkar identified Purāṇic Mahānanda with Ugrasena of the Jain Literature and Raychoudhary<sup>3</sup> and Pradhan<sup>4</sup> accepted this view. These writers seem to accept the Buddhist statements as also Purāṇic statements that ten sons of Kālāśoka ruled for 22 years and then the nine Nandas starting with Mahāpadma ruled for another 22 years. In this connection I have said<sup>5</sup> that Mahānanda (same as Kālāśoka) had 9 descendents who were Nandas and I have explained their period differently and have showed that then came Mahāpadma and his son, who together ruled for 86 years.

Purāṇic Bārhadratha genealogy is hardly studied by any scholar. There is a paucity of corroborative evidence for this period. I have, however, shown<sup>6</sup> that at one time, Bārhadratha

---

1. Chronology of Ancient India, pp. 211 ff.

2. PC pp. 78 ff.

3. PHAI p. 220-33.

4. CAI p. 225.

5. PC p. 87.

6. PC p. 76.

list had included the names of Kṣemadhanvā and kṣatraujāh, who are now found in the Śaiśunāga list.

Coming to the Mahābhārata level, Raychowdhary has examined<sup>1</sup> the question of Parikṣit and has concluded that the two Parikṣits—Purāṇic and Vedic are identical.

For the pre-Mbh genealogies, there is no serious effort made with the sole exception of Pradhan.<sup>2</sup> He has, first, fixed the contemporaneity of Daśaratha and Divodāsa and has then, examined and reconstructed pre-Mbh genealogies upto the level of Rāma Dāsarathi. He has ably shown that there were 14 or 15 generations from Rāma to Śrīkṛṣṇa in all the lines he has examined. He has examined the following lines:—Yādava, Vithavya, Magadha, Hastināpura, North and South Pāṇḍala, Aṅga, Ikṣvāku, Janaka, South Kośala and Kāśī—and in all these lines he has shown that from the kings who were contemporaries of Daśaratha to the kings who were contemporaries of Śrīkṛṣṇa there were 14 or 15 names. He has also shown<sup>3</sup> that the Aikṣvāka King Daśaratha, the father of Rāma, the Northern Pāṇḍala king Atithigya Divodāsa, the brother of Ahalyā, Senajit, the southern Pāṇḍala king, Sāivabhauma and Ṛkṣa II, the Sons of Vidaratha of the Hastināpura line, Kīta, the father of Uparicara Vasu whose descendent Brhadratha I founded the kingdom of Magadha, Romapāda Daśaratha of the dynasty of Aṅga, Sīradhvaja Janaka the father of Sītā, king Satvanta of the Yadu dynasty and the father Vitahavya, the Haihaya—all these ten kings belonged to the same age, namely the age of Divodāsa. He has also obtained a number of incidental results which are of great value in the reconstruction of our pre-Mbh period. I have examined<sup>4</sup> the pre-Mbh Ayodhyā line from Vaivasvata Manu to the level and have confirmed the view of Pradhan that the kings from Puṣya to Brhadbala were collateral (and not lineal) to the kings from Kuṣa to Śaṅkhana. I have put the number of Rāma Dāsarathi to be, 57th from

1. PHAI p. 12-21.

2. OAI pp. 3ff.

3. OAI p. 30.

4. PC p. 341 ff.

Manu Vaivasvata and that of Śrutāyu and Bṛhadbala to be 71st, thus taking 14 generations from Rāma to Kṛṣṇa.<sup>1</sup>

This Ikṣavāku dynasty has also been examined by Shri Rai Kṛṣṇadas (*Purāṇa*, Vol. II, No. 1-2). He has proposed some reconstruction of this dynasty.

Reconstruction of this as well as other pre-Mbh Purāṇic genealogies is still to be made from the point of the references to some of these kings that we get in the Vedic and Epic literature. In this connection, I should point out that I have reached some other conclusions regarding the method of reconstructing Purāṇic genealogies. I have shown in my Purāṇic chronology that Manu was a dynastic title and Manvantara meant a dynastic period and taking these senses as well as some clues furnished by Megasthenes and Herodotas into consideration, I have found that all our present Purāṇic genealogies upto the Nandas even later have been constructed in an arbitrary and artificial method, which I have designated as Manvantara-centuryyuga—Method (=MCM). According to this method, one king-name in the genealogical lists represents a time-unit of 40 years or sometimes of 20 years.

Thus the succession list, which is given in the Purāṇas, is not reliable *as such*, but this also is certain that a name mentioned in the Purāṇic genealogies generally guarantees the existence of that person as a king, not necessarily in the same chronological or successive order but most probably in the same family.

#### 4. CHRONOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION

We generally divide Purāṇic genealogies thus: Pre-Mbh genealogies, post-Mbh genealogies upto the Nandas and Post-

---

1. PO p. 341 ff. Subsequently, there has been a change in my view. I have realised that originally, the distance between Manu and Rāma was of about ten generations, and that between Rāma and Kṛṣṇa of 3 or 4 generations. The present Puranic genealogies are arranged as they are today for the specific purpose of following the Manvantara-centuryyuga-Method-which I have explained in my Purāṇic Chronology.

Nanda genealogies. Purāṇas do not give periods for the reigns of kings of the Pre-Mbh genealogies. But for the post-Mbh genealogies they give total regnal period for each of the dynasties as also individual regnal period of each of the kings of all these periods. They also give a general computation twice—from Parikṣit to Nanda and from Nanda to Āndhra—end.

Out of the post-Mbh dynasties, those which are post-Nanda are studied well, even from the point of view of their chronology but the chronology of the pre-Nanda period is hardly studied. I shall not go into the details of the chronological studies made by various scholars for the post-Nanda period. But I shall, here give, details of the studies of the most debatable question of the Purāṇic chronology that of the synchronism between Alexander the Great and Chandragupta Maurya. Sir William Jones and almost all the modern scholars agree that Sandrocottus, who was a contemporary of Alexander was Chandragupta Maurya, while a small group of Scholars have held that the Magadhan king, who was the contemporary of Alexander, was not Chandragupta Maurya, but Chandragupta I of the Gupta dynasty.

Troyer, in his *Rājatarāṅginī*, as early as A. D. 1858, advocated that Chandragupta I of the Gupta dynasty was the Magadha contemporary of Alexander. This has been supported by several other scholars also.

V. Gopal Aiyar (1901) in his '*The Chronology of Ancient India*', T. S. Narayan Shastri (1915) in his '*Age of Saṅkara and the Kings of Magadha*', M. K. Acharya, A. Somayajula (1936) in his '*Dates of Ancient Indian History*', M. Krisnamachariar (1939) in his '*Classical Sanskrit Literature*', Kalyananda Sarasvati, N. Jagannath Rao in his '*The Age of the Mahābhārata War*', Kuppiah in his '*Ancient Indian History*', D. R. Mankad (1951) in his '*Purāṇic Chronology*' D. S. Trivedi in his various articles, Indranarayan Dwivedi in '*Vishal Bharata*', Oct. 1954, Pt. Kota Venketachalam in his various books,<sup>1</sup> K. D. Sethna in

1. (1) *The Plot in Indian Chronology*, 1953.

(2) *Chronology of Nepal History*, 1953.

the issues of 'Mother India' (1956 August ff), G. C. Bose (1934) in his Bengali book '*Purāṇa Pravesha*', Gulshan Ray, Subba Rao—All these writers have supported the stand taken by Troyar in 1858.

And yet, absolutely no notice has been taken of these views in any modern history of Ancient India, nor is this view ever referred to. These writers have built up their case by refuting all the usual arguments which are advanced in support of the view that Chandragupta Maurya, was the Magadhan contemporary of Alexander. I shall briefly summarise the whole position here, without going much in individual views.

There are certain crucial points in Purāṇic Chronology. One such point is that the Purāṇas start their chronology with Parikṣit and from Parikṣit to the beginning of the Nandas, they put 1500 years. This is borne out by counting the total regnal period given to Bārhadrathas (1000), Pradyotas (138) and Śaśūnāgas (362), and also by referring to a verse<sup>1</sup> which explicitly says that from Parikṣit to the beginning of Nandas, had elapsed a period of 1500 years.

Most of the modern scholars do not accept both these, while this small group of scholars does. It is usually objected that the local regnal periods given to these dynasties do not tally with the totals of regnal periods given to individual kings. Therefore, these figures are not reliable. Similarly, the verse, which puts 1500 years between Parikṣit and the Nandas, has some other readings for 1500, such as 1015, 1115, 1150. Generally, the scholars accept the lowest figures and explain the totals also that way. In so doing, they have often to put their own construction on the Purāṇic evidence. But this small

(1) Chronology of Kashmir History, reconstructed 1955.

(4) Indian Eras 1956.

(5) Age of Buddha, Mīlinda and Antiyoka and Yuga Purāṇa 1956.

(6) The Historicity of Vikramāditya and Śalivāhana 1957.

(7) Ancient Hindu History Vols. I-II, 1957.

1. महापद्मानिषेकालु यावज्जन्मपरीक्षितः ।  
पूर्वं वर्षसहस्रं तु द्वेयं पञ्चशतोत्तरम् ॥



group of scholars accept both the figures as they are given in the Purāṇas. This is one main point of difference in Purāṇic chronology.

Another crucial point is the use of certain eras. Purāṇic chronology is based on two eras—Kali Era and Saptarṣi Era. There is also a calculation based on Manvantara. Modern scholars completely ignore the evidence of these eras and of Manvantara.

According to the Purāṇic traditions, Kali Era started in B. C. 3101 and Saptarṣi Era in 3176 B. C. Now it is stated in the Purāṇas that Kali started on the day on which Kṛṣṇa died. Therefore, Kṛṣṇa's death will be put in 3101 B. C. and the Mbh war will be dated a few years earlier, say in 3126 or 3136 B. C.

Purāṇic scholars have shown<sup>1</sup> that, according to the Purāṇas, Saptarṣi Era was in Maghhā in the days of Parikṣit and it was again in Maghhā in the days of 24th or 27th Āndhra king. Saptarṣi Era is a cycle of 2700 years and therefore, according to this statement, 2700 years had elapsed from Parikṣit to the 24th or 27th Āndhra.

Similarly, I have shown<sup>2</sup> on Purāṇic evidence that a Manvantara lasted for 2840 years and that a Manvantara had started with Parikṣit and ended with the rise of the Guptas.

These calculations based on Saptarṣi Era and Manvantara calculations show that between Parikṣit and the rise of the Guptas, about 2800 years had elapsed and putting Parikṣit in 3101 B. C., the rise of the Guptas falls in c. 300 B. C.

According to the Purāṇas, Kali Era started at the death of Kṛṣṇa and therefore at the accession of Parikṣit. Kali had ended in the days of Sumitra and Kṣemaka i. e. in the days of Viśākkhayūpa, the fourth king of the Pradyota dynasty. It has

---

1. See Indian Eras by Pt. K. Venkatachalam, and PC pp. 323 ff. Pargiter's frantic efforts to explain away this are not at all convincing.

2. PC pp. 42 ff.

been shown<sup>1</sup> that this Kali Era was of 1200 years and though it had ended in the days of Sumitra and Viśākhayūpa, Kali Era continued and continues even to-day.

These calculations are corroborated by the total number of years assigned to various post-Mbh dynasties upto the rise of the Guptas. These Purāṇic scholars, have worked out<sup>2</sup> details of these calculations very accurately.

Most of the modern scholars, on the other hand, do not consider these statements about these eras, but take as their basis of calculations the number of years given to various post-Mbh dynasties ; but they always select the smallest period, where two or more calculations are available and even then have to put their own construction at several places in order to make the Purāṇic figures fit in with their own chronology. Their method is this. Putting Chandragupta Muṛya in c. 327 B. C. they go backward and forward and adjust the Purāṇic figures. They take Chandragupta Maurya's date—arrived at by them as the central point, while the Purāṇic scholars take traditional date of the Mbh war as the central point.

Purāṇic scholars, who put about 2800 years between Parikṣit and the rise of the Guptas, put Chandragupta the First Gupta as the contemporary of Alexander. These scholars have examined and refuted all these points<sup>3</sup> which, according to the present day chronology, militate against putting Chandragupta I in C. 320 B. C.

These points are the mention of Yona kings in the Piyadasi inscriptions, Date of Buddha's death, Beginning of the Gupta Era as fixed by modern scholars to be in 318-19 A. D. Harṣa Era, Śaka Era, Kṛta Era etc.\*

1. PO pp. 60 ff.

2. See particularly, pt. K. Venkatachalam, T. S. Narayan Shastri, Mankad, V. Jagannath Rao and K. D. Sethna.

3. See particularly the writings of pt. Kota Venkatachalam, T. S. N. Shastri, Mankad and Sethna.

\* I must, however, say that the reference to the Yona kings in the Piyadasi inscriptions has not been satisfactorily explained.

Some attempts have been made to study the pre-Bhārata war chronology, but here the material is scanty and often uncertain. However, some attempts in this direction are noteworthy.

Pusalkar in the Vedic Age, takes 3102 B. C., which is the usual date for Flood in Mesopotamia, to be the date of Manu Vaivasvata. He, then divides the ancient Indian Historical periods thus; The Manu Vaivasvata Period (3102) B. C., The Yayāti Period (3000-2750 B. C.), the Paraśurāma Period (2550-2350 B. C.). The Rāma-candra Period (2350 B. C.—1950 B. C.), The Kṛṣṇa Period (1950-1450 B. C.). His method is that of counting generations given in the Purāṇas by taking an average of 18 years for one ruling generation. He has taken 95 generations between Manu and the Bhārata war and thus has put the Bhārata war in  $3100 - (95 \times 18 = 1710) = \text{C. } 1400 \text{ B. C.}$

P. L. Bhargava<sup>1</sup> has divided the ancient period into Eras called—The Era of Saptasindhu, The Era of conquest, the Era of Expansion and the Era of Settlement. This is from the point of Aryan advent and expansion in India. His method of settling the ancient chronology is this: He takes his stand on the Purāṇic verse which says that 1050 (with v. 1.) years had elapsed between the birth of Parikṣit and the coronation of Mahāpadma Nanda. But he takes Parikṣit of this verse, not to be that Parikṣit who was the grandson of Arjuna, but to be that Parikṣit who is given in the Paurava genealogy at an early stage. He takes<sup>2</sup> this Parikṣit to be the same as Kuru the son of Samvarana and as such to be the first king of the Kurus as separate from the Pāṇḍavas.

Having called this Parikṣit as Parikṣit I, he puts 1050 years between the birth of the Parikṣit I and Mahāpadma Nanda. And taking 360 B. C. as the date of the coronation of Mahāpadma, he puts<sup>3</sup> the birth of this Parikṣit I in  $360 + 1050 : 1410 \text{ B. C.}$  He has, then, fixed his chronology by counting the generations of kings, taking an average of 20 years for one ruling

---

1. India in the Vedic Age p. 96 ff.

2. Ibid. p. 46.

3. Ibid. p. 128-29 ff.

generation. He has taken 81 generations from Ikṣvāku to Parikṣit I and thus putting the accession of Parikṣit I in 1380 B. C. and adding to it  $81 \times 20 = 1620$  he gets 3000 B. C. as date of Ikṣvāku. He puts the Bhārata war in 1000 B. C. putting it 32 generations before Mahāpadma.

Shri M. N. Yajuik in his "*Genealogical Tables of the Solar and the Lunar Dynasties*" Baroda, 1930 gave only from Viṣṇupurāṇa 12 dynasties and tried to fix up certain dates. He puts Manu Vaivasvata in 6000 B. C., Rāma in 3250 B. C. and Mbh war in 1898 B. C.

S. C. Bose in his '*Purāṇa Praveśa*, Calcutta 1920 (in Bengali) has said that Kalpa is a cycle of 5000 years divided into 14 Manvantaras (one of 359 years and thirteen of 357 years each) as also four yugas in proportion of 4 : 3 : 2 : 1. According to him Bhārata war took place in 1416 B. C. the beginning of the Kali Age was 1458 B. C. and of Kṛta Age 5958 B. C.

Pargiter examined the question of Purāṇic chronology on the basis of Yuga-calculations of Satya, Tretā, Dvāpara and Kali. Some other scholars<sup>1</sup> also have tried to examine the question of the yugas. Usually, Kali is given 4,32,000 years. Dvāpara is given 8,64,000 years, Tretā is given 17,28,000 years and Kṛta or Satya is given 34,56,000 years. These are considered Mānava years. When they are changed to Divya years, each of this period is divided by 360 and then Kali will have 1200 divya years, Dvāpara 2400, Tretā 3600 and Kṛta 4800 Divya years. Some scholars have said that these are the real Mānava years, which were later taken as divya. Again here the proportion is 1. 2. 3. 4. It has been pointed out<sup>2</sup> that originally the proportion was 1. 1. 1. 1 and therefore each Yuga will have 1200 years and if we take out 200 years of the sandhyā and sandhyāṁśa each Yuga will have 1000 years. Thus it has been shown<sup>3</sup> that from Manu Vaivasvata to Śiśunāga

1. Tilak (The Arotic Home), Rangaacharya (The Yugas), V. S. Aiyer (The Chronology of Ancient India), S. B. Dikarkit (Bharatiya Jyotiḥśāstra).

2. PO pp. 320-1.

3. PO pp. 60 ff.

(Sumitra, Kalki), four yugas i. e. 4000 years had elapsed. Thus the yuga calculations are applied to ancient Purāṇic chronology.

Some other scholars have given some dates for Manu Vaivasvata and some other subsequent kings and events. I have given<sup>1</sup> some dates by using a method which I have called Manvantara centuryyuga Method.

Attempts have also been made<sup>2</sup> to equate some of the earlier Purāṇic dates with the dates in earlier Kashmirian and Nepalese genealogies.

Pradhan has put<sup>3</sup> 14 to 15 generations between Rāma and Kṛṣṇa and has put about 300 years between them.

In Vaidika Sāhitya Pariśilana (1953) by Shr Rajnikant Shastri an attempt has been made to fix up the dates of principal R̥gvedic ṛṣis, by connecting them with certain Purāṇic kings and counting the number of these Purāṇic kings. Thus Madhuchandas, the son of Viśvāmitra is taken as a contemporary of Hariścandra and as Hariścandra is removed upwards from Mbh war by 61 king-units, his date is taken to be  $61 \times 25 : 1525$  i. e.  $1525 + 3101$  (date of Kali start) : 4626 B. C.

In my '*Date of R̥gveda*' (1951) I have also fixed the dates of R̥gvedic ṛṣis on somewhat different lines.

Here ends my survey of these studies. It is likely that for want of information, I might have not been able to refer to other attempts in this direction, for which I beg to be excused.

This survey of Purāṇic studies in modern times shows that the Purāṇas are now being recognised as an important source of ancient Indian History. Purāṇas had been already recognised for the period upto the Śaiśunāgas. Now several scholars have a tendency to recognise even the pre-Bhārata war period of the Purāṇas.

1. PO Ch. 2.

2. D. S. Trivedi, Pt. K. Venkatachalam, Mankad.

3. CAI in several chapters.

In this connection, I would point out here that though our studies, few as they are, stop at Manu Vaivasvata, the Purāṇas have a period which may be termed as prediluvian or pre-flood period. For this period, the Purāṇas have preserved the genealogy of Svāyambhuva Manu. This genealogy, though given as one continuous genealogy, is, in fact, composed of two or three branches, one starting with Svāyambhuva Manu and the other starting with Cākṣuṣa Manu. Moreover, there is a third genealogy—that of Priyavata which, to some extent, can be called pre-diluvian. These pre-flood lines are not studied yet, but they deserve a close study. Pre-flood dynasties of Egypt, Babylon, Sumer etc. have been studied and they have yielded some results. Pre-flood i. e. Pre-Vaivasvata dynasties of India also are likely to yield good results.

Again, Buddhistic Mahāvamśa, Dīpavamśa and the Jain Āgamas and their commentaries as well as what are called Jain Purāṇas are known to throw valuable light on the period of Buddha and Mahāvīra; but if used properly they are likely to throw good light on Bārhadratha to Maurya dynasties. Some light is likely to be thrown on the pre-Bhārata period also.

Earlier Purāṇic materials are likely to throw light on the Harappan culture also.

# GENEALOGY OF THE SOLAR DYNASTY IN THE PURĀṆAS AND THE RĀMĀYAṆA : A CRITICAL STUDY\*

By

A. D. PUSALKER

[ लेखेऽस्मिन् डा० पुसाळकरमहोदयेन रामायणे पुराणे  
चोपवर्णितस्य सूर्यवंशस्य विषये आलोचनात्मको विचारः प्रस्तुतः ।  
सूर्यवंशस्य प्रवर्तको वैवस्वतमनोः पुत्र इक्ष्वाकुः प्रासीत् । पुराणेषु  
सूर्यवंशस्य वर्णनमितरवंशापेक्षया विस्तृततरं वर्तते । रामायणे तु  
रामपर्यन्तमेव सूर्यवंशावली कथिता । अतोऽस्मिन्नेले सूर्यवंशविषयको  
विचारो रामपर्यन्तमेव प्रस्तूयते । पुराणोपवर्णितायाः सूर्यवंशावल्याः  
पाजिटर-रंगाचार्य-मनकड-भागवोपाह्वै विद्वद्भिः सम्यग्विचारः कृतः, अत्र  
तु लेखकमहोदयेन मूलग्रन्थानां सम्यगवलोकनानन्तरं सूर्यवंशसूचीविषये  
स्वमतमुपस्थापितं लेखस्यान्ते च सूर्यवंशावलीविषयिका स्वनिर्मिता  
एका सूच्यपि संयोजिता ।

महाभारते, हरिवंशे, पुराणेषु च सूर्यवंशसूचीविषये प्रायः सादृश्यं  
वर्तते, परन्तु रामायणे सूचीयमतीव संक्षिप्ता वर्तते । अत्र इक्ष्वाकु-  
वंशीयानां केषांचिद्वृत्तानां नामान्यपि पुराणकथितानामभ्यो भिद्यन्ते  
क्रमोऽपि क्वचिद् भिद्यते । पुराणोक्तासु सूर्यवंशीयसूचीषु मनुमारभ्य  
रामपर्यन्तं नृपाणां न्यूनतमा संख्या सप्तपञ्चाशत्, रामायणे तु पञ्चत्रिंशदे-  
व । परन्तु रामायणं तु वस्तुतः काव्यमेव, न त्वितिहासः, पुराणानां  
च राजवंशवर्णनं प्रधानं लक्षणम् । अतः इतिहासदृष्ट्या रामायणसूची  
नातीवोपयुक्ता । कालिदासेनापि रघुवंशकाव्ये इक्ष्वाकुवंशप्रभवानां  
नृपाणां चरितवर्णने तु रामायणमाश्रितम्, परन्तु सूर्यवंशावलीवर्णने पुराणा-  
न्येवाश्रितानि । ]

The dynasty started by Ikshvāku, son of Vaivasvata Manu, was known as the solar dynasty, and it produced such celebrated figures as Kakutsa, Mādhātṛi, Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Sagara, Bhagīratha, Ambarīsha, Raghu, Rāma and others. The importance of the dynasty in traditional history can also be seen from the fact that the

\* Paper submitted to the History Section of the All-India Oriental Conference, Srinagar.

genealogical list of this dynasty in the Purāṇas is more detailed and complete as compared with the lists of other dynasties. The genealogy of the solar dynasty (either whole or in part) appears in as many as eleven Mahā-Purāṇas, the *Saura* and the *Śiva Upa-Purāṇas*, the *Harivaṃśa*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. As the genealogy given in the *Rāmāyaṇa* runs only up to Rāma, we shall consider here the solar dynasty up to Rāma only.

The genealogy of the solar dynasty, as given in the Purāṇas, has been considered, more or less fully, by Pargiter, Rangacharya, Mankad and Bhargava. After going through these learned treatises, I made my own study on the basis of the original texts and have prepared my own list. A comparative study of the lists in the Purāṇas, the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Mahābhārata* (so far as they go) shows that they are in general agreement on the whole. The *Rāmāyaṇa* genealogy, however, is much shorter, contains several omissions with considerable differences regarding names and order of the persons, and has a number of new names. The *Rāmāyaṇa* gives the genealogy at two places, which is almost identical.

In dealing with the Purāṇa lists it is to be borne in mind that it is not always correct to regard as genuine or nearer the original the list that contains a smaller number. In the first place, it is likely that the particular text is deficient and has lost the portion containing the missing names. It is well known that in course of transmission some Purāṇas have lost original parts. Secondly, some Purāṇas definitely state that with regard to particular lists, they have not given them exhaustively but have listed only the important names. Thus, the *Mutya*, which lists only important names, omits as many as twelve names, so that we cannot rule out as later interpolation the names uniformly found in the other Purāṇas, especially if they are corroborated by other sources. It is, therefore, not safe either to regard the smaller number in any particular Purāṇa as indicative of genuineness or larger number of later interpolations. Further, we cannot always rely on the view



of the majority of the Purāṇas, because in some cases it is possible that some of the Purāṇas are mere copies of the relevant parts from the other Purāṇas. Every case is to be considered on its merits. It is again to be noted that a particular Purāṇa, found to be trustworthy regarding a particular dynasty, may not be equally trustworthy with regard to other dynasties. Even in the portion dealing with a particular dynasty there may be found corrupt or interpolated passages. It is, therefore, necessary that every stanza or every line must be considered independently on the basis of the data furnished by all Purāṇas. In the accompanying table, I have given the Purāṇic lists according to Bhargava, Pargiter, Rangacharya, Mankad and myself, the last column being allotted to the *Rāmāyaṇa* list.

The Purāṇic lists show that the solar dynasty contained at least 57 names from Manu to Rāma. So far as the portions in the *Mahābhārata* are concerned, it is seen that they are in general agreement with the Purāṇas. The *Rāmāyaṇa*, however, springs a great surprise by presenting a much smaller number of kings in the dynasty, viz. 35. Thus our sources present two wholly divergent genealogies-

Before comparing the Purāṇic list with that in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, it may be observed that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is not a historical work, though it deals with history incidentally; it is a *kāvya*. It is not much concerned with genealogies. The Purāṇas, on the other hand, profess to give traditional history and genealogical lists, and hence *prima facie* have a superior claim to trustworthiness.

As compared to the Purāṇic list, the *Rāmāyaṇa* list has several omissions; the individuals occupy different positions; and there are several new names. It is found that such celebrated names from the Purāṇic list of solar dynasty as Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Hariśchandra, Rohita, Bhagīratha, Riturparṇa, Sudāsa, and Aśmaka, are conspicuous by their absence in the *Rāmāyaṇa* list. Now, the Purāṇas get confirmation from other authorities such as the *Rigveda* and later Vedic texts and

the *Mahābhārata* with regard to the fact that all these kings belonged to the solar dynasty. Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Tridhanva, Trayyāruṇa, Hariśchandra and Rohita are well known to Vedic literature as belonging to the Ikshvāku (solar) dynasty. Rituparna occurs in the famous Nala story in the Great Epic. Though the second *Rāmāyaṇa* list admits the existence of Sudāsa by calling Kalmāshapāda "Saundāsa", the name Sudāsa is omitted in both lists and Kalmāshapāda is spoken of as the son of Raghu. The *Mahābhārata* declares Kalmāshapāda to be the son of Sudāsa, and mentions Aśmaka, omitted in the *Rāmāyaṇa* lists, as Kalmāshapāda's son. (The well-known Hariśchandra story is given in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as a story of Ambaiśha, and though we can say that Ambaiśha may have been another name of Hariśchandra, the *Rāmāyaṇa* is wrong in stating Nahusha to be his son instead of Rohita. We must thus conclude that the Purāṇic lists, supported as they are by independent texts, are correct, and the *Rāmāyaṇa* list is untrustworthy and defective as regards length. When considered as a whole, therefore, the *Rāmāyaṇa* list is open to grave doubt.

If we turn to details, it is found that there are considerable differences in the order of names in both sets of lists. Kakutstha, who appears as the son of Śasāda and the third earliest king in the line in the Purāṇic list, appears quite late in the *Rāmāyaṇa* list as the son of Bhagīratha and grandson of Dilīpa. The Purāṇas are corroborated by the *Mahābhārata*, which states that from Kakutstha's time the kings bore the title Kākutstha and that Dilīpa was his descendant. Ambaiśha, whom the *Rāmāyaṇa* places three steps above Nābhāga, was in reality the son of Nābhāga according to the Purāṇas supported by the *Mahābhārata*.

Though the *Rāmāyaṇa* list contains a smaller number, all the names cannot be taken to belong to the solar dynasty. The list wrongly includes Nahusha and Yayāti who were obviously rulers of the lunar dynasty. Some names are not found in the Purāṇas.

For the above reasons we conclude that the *Rāmāyaṇa* genealogy of the solar dynasty is defective and unreliable. From the fact that for other particulars in his *Raghuvamśa* Kālidāsa draws on the *Rāmāyaṇa* but depends on other sources for his genealogy, it seems more likely that the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* used by Kālidāsa had no genealogies than that he preferred the Purāṇa lists to those in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In dealing with the unreliability of the *Rāmāyaṇa* list, Pargiter has, in some instances, referred to the *Raghuvamśa* in support of the Purāṇic statements; but the *Raghuvamśa* cannot be considered to be an independent authority in this connection.

The differences between the Purāṇic and *Rāmāyaṇa* genealogies are so obvious that it cannot be asserted that both are in general agreement. Dr. Daftary relies on the *Rāmāyaṇa* genealogy of the solar dynasty in preference to the Purāṇic list possibly as the former contains fewer names. From the *Rāmāyaṇa* list also he omits as many as eleven names. Dr. Daftary's scheme of genealogical tables based on his study of the Purāṇic accounts would form the subject of an independent paper.

Bhāgava	Pargiter	Rangacharya	Mankad	Writer (A. D. Fusalker)	Rāmāyana
1. Manu	1. Manu	1. Manu	1. Manu	1. Manu	1. Manu
2. Ikshvāku	2. Ikshvāku	2. Ikshvāku	2. Ikshvāku	2. Ikshvāku	2. Ikshvāku
3. Vikukshi	3. Vikukshi- Śasāda	3. Vikukshi (Śasāda)	3. Vikukshi- Śasāda	3. Vikukshi	3. Kukshi
4. Kakutstha	4. Kakutstha	4. Kakutstha	4. Kakutstha	4. Kakutstha	4. Vikukshi
5. Anenas	5. Anenas	5. Anenas	5. Anenas	5. Anenas	5. Bāṇa
6. Prithu	6. Prithu	6. Prithu	6. Prithu	6. Prithu	6. Anaranya
7. Vishṭarāśva	7. Vishṭarāśva	7. Vishṭarāśva	7. Vishṭarāśva	7. Vishṭarāśva	7. Prithu
8. Ādra	8. Ādra	8. Ādra	8. Ādra	8. Ādra	8. Trisāṅku
9. Yuvanāśva I	9. Yuvanāśva I	9. Yuvanāśva I	9. Yuvanāśva I	9. Yuvanāśva I	9. Dhundhumāra
10. Śrāvasta	10. Śrāvasta	10. Śrāvasta	10. Śrāvasta	10. Śrāvasta	
11. Br̥hadaśva	11. Br̥hadaśva	11. Br̥hadaśva	11. Br̥hadaśva	11. Br̥hadaśva	
12. Kuvalaśva	12. Kuvalaśva	12. Kuvalaśva	12. Kuvalaśva	12. Kuvalaśva	

13. Dṛiḍhaśva	13. Dṛiḍhaśva	13. Dṛiḍhaśva	13. Dṛiḍhaśva	13. Dṛiḍhaśva
14. Pramoda	14. Pramoda	14. Pramoda	14. Pramoda	14. Pramoda
15. Haryaśva I	15. Haryaśva I	15. Haryaśva I	15. Haryaśva I	15. Haryaśva I
16. Nikumbha	16. Nikumbha	16. Nikumbha	16. Nikumbha	16. Nikumbha
17. Saṁhataśva	17. Saṁhataśva	17. Saṁhataśva	17. Saṁhataśva	17. Saṁhataśva
18. Akṛitāśva	18. Akṛitāśva	18. Akṛitāśva	18. Akṛitāśva	18. Akṛitāśva
19. Prasenañjit	19. Prasenañjit	19. Prasenañjit	19. Prasenañjit	19. Prasenañjit
20. Yuvañāśva II	20. Yuvañāśva II	20. Yuvañāśva II	20. Yuvañāśva II	20. Yuvañāśva II
21. Māndhatṛi	21. Māndhatṛi	21. Māndhatṛi	21. Māndhatṛi	21. Māndhatṛi
22. Durgaha				11. Māndhatṛi
23. Girikshit				12. Susandhi
24. Purukutsa	22. Purukutsa	22. Purukutsa	21. Purukutsa	13. Dhruvasandhi
25. Trasadasyu	23. Trasadasyu	23. Trasadasyu	22. Trasadasyu	14. Bharata
26.				22. Purukutsa
				23. Trasadasyu

Bhargava	Pargiter	Rangacharya	Mankad	Writer (A. D. Puskalkar)	Rāmāyana
27. Sambhūta	24. Sambhūta	24. Sambhūta	23. Sambhūta	24. Sambhūta	
28. Vishnu- vṛiddha					
29. Anarāṇya	25. Anarāṇya	25. Anarāṇya		25. Anarāṇya	
30. Trasadaśva	26. Trasadaśva	26. Pṛishadaśva		26. Trasadaśva	
31. Haryaśva II	27. Haryaśva II	27. Haryaśva II		27. Haryaśva II	
32. Hasta		(Hasta)		28. Hasta	
33. Rohidaśva					
34. Vasumanas	28. Vasumat	28. Vasumanas		29. Vasumanas	
35. Trivṛishan	29. Tridhanvan	29. Tridhanvan	24. Tridhanvan	30. Tridhanvan	
36. Tryarūpa	30. Trayyārūpa	30. Trayyārūpa	25. Trayyārūpa	31. Trayyārūpa	
	31. ....				
37. Trisāṅku	32. Satyavrata- Trisāṅku	31. Satyavrata- Trisāṅku	26. Satyavrata- Trisāṅku	32. Satyavrata- Trisāṅku	

38. Hariscandra	33. Hariscandra	32. Hariscandra	27. Hariscandra	33. Hariscandra
39. Rohita	34. Rohita	33. Rohitaśva	28. Rohita	34. Rohita
40. Harita	35. Harita- Chañchu	34. Harita (or Haritaśva (Sañchu)	29. Harita	35. Harita
41. Chañchu			30. Chañchu	36. Chañcha
42. Vijaya	36. Vijaya	35. Vijaya	31. Vijaya	37. Vijaya
43. Ruruka	37. Ruruka	36. Ruruka (or Kuruka)	32. Ruruka	38. Ruruka
44. Vrika	38. Vrika	37. Vrika	33. Vrika	39. Vrika
45. Bāhu	39. Bāhu (Asita)	38. Bāhu (Asita)	34. Bāhu (Asita)	40. Bāhu (Asita)
	40. ....			15. Asita
46. Sagara	41. Sagara	39. Sagara	35. Sagara	16. Sagara
47. (Asamañjas)	42. Asamañjas	40. Asamañja	36. Asamañja	17. Asamañjas
48. Amśumat	43. Amśumat	41. Amśumān	37. Amśumat	18. Amśumat
49. Dilipa	44. Dilipa I	42. Dilipa I	38. Dilipa I	19. Dilipa
50. Bhagīratha	45. Bhagīratha	43. Bhagīratha	39. Bhagīratha	20. Bhagīratha

Bhāṅgava	Pargiter	Rangacharya	Mankad	Writer (A. D. Pseudonym)	Rāmāyaṇa
51. Suhotra					21. Kakutstha
52. Śruta	46. Śruta	44. Śruta (or Suhotra)	40. Śrute	46. Śruta	22. Raghu
53. Nābhāga	47. Nābhāga	45. Nābhāga	41. Nābhāga	47. Nābhāga	
(54) Ambarisha	48. Ambarisha	46. Ambarisha	42. Ambarisha	48. Ambarisha	
55. Sindhudvīpa	49. Sindhudvīpa	47. Sindhudvīpa	43. Sindhudvīpa	49. Sindhudvīpa	
56. Ayutāyus	50. Ayutāyus	48. Ayutāyus	44. Ayutāyus	50. Ayutāyus	
57. Rītuparṇa	51. Rītuparṇa	49. Rītuparṇa	45. Rītuparṇa	51. Rītuparṇa	
58. Sarvakāma	52. Sarvakāma	50. Sarvakāma	46. Sarvakāma	52. Sarvakāma	
59. Sudāsa	53. Sudāsa	51. Sudāsa	47. Sudāsa	53. Sudāsa	
60. Mitrāsaha	54. Mitrāsaha- Kalmāshapāda	52. Saudāsa-Mitra- saha-Kalmāshapāda	48. Mitrāsaha- Kalmāshapāda	54. Mitrāsaha- Kalmāshapāda	23. Kalmāshapāda
61. Āsmaka	55. Āsmaka	53. Āsmaka	49. Āsmaka	55. Āsmaka	24. Śaṅkhana
62. Mūlaka	56. Mūlaka	54. Mūlaka	50. Mūlaka	56. Mūlaka	25. Sudarśana



63. Śataratha	57. Śataratha	51. Śataratha	57. Śataratha	25. Agnivarṇa
64. Idavida			58. Idavida	27. Śighraga
65. Vṛddha- śarman	58. Aidavida Vṛddhaśarman	52. Aidavida- Vṛddhaśarman	59. Aidavida- Vṛddhaśarman	28. Maru
66. Viśvasaha I	59. Viśvasaha I		60. Viśvasaha I	29. Pruśūruka (-va in II. 110)
67. Dilīpa Kha- tvāṅga	60. Dilīpa II Khatvāṅga	53. Dilīpa II Khatvāṅga	61. Dilīpa II Khatvāṅga	30. Ambarisha
68. Dīrghabāhu	61. Dīrghabāhu			31. Nabusha
69. Raghu	62. Raghu	54. Raghu	62. Raghu	32. Yayāti (omi- tted in II. 110)
70. Aja	63. Aja	55. Aja	63. Aja	33. Nābhāga
71. Daśaratha	64. Daśaratha	56. Daśaratha	64. Daśaratha	34. Aja
72. Rāma	65. Rāma	57. Rāma	65. Rāma	35. Daśaratha
				36. Rāma

## धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणानां वेदोपबृंहणत्वम्

( पं. के० वि० नीलमेधाचार्य )

[ In this article the learned writer has explained how the Itihāsa and the Purāṇas amplify the Veda, and has tried to show that the spirit of the Purāṇas is to take the *arthavāda* portions of the Śruti in the literal sense and as real historical facts (and not as allegories), occurring and reoccurring in the same form in every *Kalpa*. The Mīmāṃsakas, however, have disregarded this spirit of the Itihāsa-Purāṇas, and have taken such historical portions of the Veda as *guṇavāda* or figurative statements. The writer has criticised this *guṇavāda* explanation of the Mīmāṃsakas, and has shown how such portions of the Śruti have been amplified as true history by the Purāṇas. This kind of amplification is called the उपबृंहण of the Veda by the Itihāsa-Purāṇas. According to his view, to explain these portions of the Śruti, and the Ākhyānas of the Purāṇas, which are based on Śruti, as allegories or metaphors is to misinterpret the Veda. He calls this tendency of the Mīmāṃsakas and the modern Indologists as 'वेदप्रतारणा' (deceiving the Veda).

And, to explain the *arthavāda*-portions of the Śruti, and the Ākhyāna-portions of the Itihāsa-Purāṇa as historical facts is also the उपबृंहण or amplification of the Veda by means of Itihāsa-Purāṇa. ]

“इमे वेदा अनन्ताः”, “अनन्ता वै वेदाः” इति हि श्रूयते । वेदशाखाः परिगणयन् भगवान् पतञ्जलिर्ब्रह्मणो एकशतमध्वर्युशाखाः सहस्रवर्त्ता सामवेदः, एकविंशतिधा बाह्वृच्यम्, नवधाऽऽथर्वणो वेदः” इति । एषु सशिरस्केषु वेदेषु सिद्धसाध्यात्मना द्विविधा बहवोऽर्थाः प्रतिपाद्यन्ते । तत्राभ्युदयसाधनानि नाना-

विधानि काम्यकर्माणि, अकरणनिबन्धनप्रत्यवायपरिहारार्थान्यनेकानि नित्यनैमित्तिक-  
कर्माणि, अभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससाधनानि तत्तद्देवतोपासनप्रभृतीनि ब्रह्मोपासनान्तानि  
बहून्युपासनानि, मोक्षसाधनोभूता ब्रह्मविद्या इत्यादयो बहवः साध्यार्था विधीयन्ते  
येषु प्रवृत्तिर्युज्यते । अनर्थोदकाणि असत्यवदनादीनि बहूनि पापकर्माणि  
निषिध्यन्ते, येभ्यो निवृत्तिर्युज्यते । परं ब्रह्म परमात्मा पुरुषोत्तमस्ततो जगतः  
सृष्टिस्थितिलया द्रष्टाण्डानि चतुर्दशभुवनानि पुण्यपापकर्मफलभोगभूमयो देवतिर्यङ्-  
मनुष्यस्थावरात्मना चतुर्विधानि भूतानि विग्रहहविरादानकर्मसन्निधिप्रोतिफलप्रदानादि-  
नानाविशेषोपेता देवता इत्यादयो बहवः सिद्धार्था विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रब्राह्मणोपनिषदादि-  
षु वैदिकेषु भागेषु संप्रतिपाद्यन्ते । तत्र संयोगरूपचोदनाख्यानामविशेषे नाना-  
शाखोदितानि दर्शपूर्णमासादीनि कर्माणि शाण्डिल्यविद्यादयो विद्याश्चैकत्वं प्रतिपाद्यन्त  
इति पूर्वोत्तरमीमांसासिद्धम् ।<sup>१</sup> नानाशाखोदितानां कर्मणां विद्यानां चैक्यस्य  
फलं नन्विदमेव यद् अनधीतशाखोदितानि कर्मसु अनधीतशाखोदितानुपास्य-

१. पूर्वमीमांसा अ० २, पा० ४, अ० २ । तत्रेदं विचारितम् यत्—  
काठककाण्वमाध्यंदिनतैत्तरीयादिशाखासु दर्शपूर्णमासाख्यं कर्म विहितम् । तत्र संशय्यते इह  
शाखाभेदात् कर्म भिद्यते नवेति । किं तावत् प्राप्तम् । शाखाभेदात् कर्म भिद्यते । कुतः  
कर्मभेदकानां नामभेदादीनां सत्त्वात् । तथाहि—काठककाण्वादिको नामभेदः ।  
काशीरीवाक्यान्यधीयानाः केचिच्छास्त्रिनोभूमीभुजते नापरे तथेति धर्मभेदः । एकस्यां शाखायां  
पठ्यमानाः “इषे त्वा” इत्यादयो मन्त्राः पलाशशाखाच्छेदादयः क्रियाश्च शाखान्तरेऽपि तथैवा-  
धीयन्त इति पुनश्चक्तिः । अतः शाखाभेदात् कर्मभेद इति पूर्वपक्षे प्राप्ते उच्यते, संयोग-  
रूपचोदनाख्याऽविशेषादेकं कर्म । यदेवैकस्यां शाखाग्रामाग्नेयाष्टाकगान्नादियागरूपं श्रूयते  
तदेवेतरत्रापि श्रूयत इति रूपाभेदः । “दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां यजेत” इति चोदनाप्येकरूपा ।  
“दर्शपूर्णमासौ” इति कर्मनामाप्येकम् । “स्वर्गकामः” इतिफलसंयोगोप्येकः । अतोऽ-  
भिन्नं कर्म । पूर्वपक्षहेतवस्त्व न्ययासिद्धाः । काठकादिकं न कर्मनामः “काठकेन यजेत”  
इत्यश्रवणात् । किंतु तद् अन्यनाम । भूभोजनादिरध्ययनधर्मः, नतु कर्माङ्गम् । अथ्ये-  
त्तृणां भिन्नत्वात् तान् प्रति पुनः पुनर्वक्तव्यं भवतीति पुनश्चक्तिरप्यन्ययासिद्धा । अतोऽन्यथा-  
सिद्धरूपप्रत्यभिज्ञया शाखाभेदेऽपि कर्म न भिद्यते इति गम्यते ।

उत्तरमीमांसा अ० ३, पा० ३, अ० १ । तत्रेदं विचार्यते । किं सर्वेषु  
वेदान्तेषु श्रूयमाणा दहरादिविद्या एका, उत विद्यान्तरमिति संशयः । अविशेषपुनः,  
अब्रणस्यप्रकरणान्तरस्य च विद्याभेदहेतोः सत्त्वाद्विद्यान्तरमिति पूर्वपक्षः । चोदनाफल-  
संयोगरूपाख्यानामविशेषाद्विचैक्यम् । प्रतिपत्तृभेदात्पुनः अब्रणमुपपद्यते । अतएव  
प्रकरणान्तरमपि नास्तीति सिद्धान्तः ॥

गुणान् विद्यासु चोपसंहृत्य कर्मणां विद्यानां चानुष्ठानं कार्यमिति । अत्रेमाश्चिन्ताः प्रवर्तन्ते यद् एकद्वशाखाधीतिनाऽवर्गद्वशा पुरुषेण शाखान्तरोदितान्यङ्गानि गुणाश्च कथं नाम ज्ञायेन् ? कथं तरां च तदुपसंहारपूर्व कर्माणि विद्याश्चानुष्ठीयेन् ? विविधासु शाखासु तत्र तत्र विप्रकीर्णतया प्रतिपादिता वर्णाश्रमधर्मादयो धर्मा अधर्माश्च एकद्वशाखाधीतिना कथं नु साकल्येन ज्ञायेन् ? कथं च पूर्वोत्तरसीमा-सयोः स्थालीपुलकन्यायेन कर्मब्रह्मकाण्डस्थानि कानिचित्संदिग्धार्थकानि वचना-न्युदाहृत्य तत्र पूर्वपक्षनिरासपुरःसरं सिद्धान्तस्थापनेनार्थो निर्णयितेऽपि अनुदाहृतानां सन्दिग्धार्थकानां बहूनां वचनानामर्थो निर्णयिते ? इति । अस्मिन् चिन्ताप्रसङ्गे समाधानार्थमेवेदं वचनं प्रवृत्ते “इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत् । विमेत्यल्प-श्रुताद्धेदो मामयं प्रतरेदिति ॥” इति । अत्रेतिहासपुराणग्रहणं धर्मशास्त्राणा-मप्युपलक्षणम् । अनेन वचनेन धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणैर्वेदस्योपबृंहणं कार्यमिति विधीयते । उपबृंहणं नाम स्वावगतवेदार्थस्य व्यक्तीकरणम् । यथा वेदेन “अहरहः सन्ध्यामुपासीत” इति विहितस्य सन्ध्योपासनस्य शरीरशुद्धिप्रकारदन्त-धावनस्नानादिविशेषैः सह निष्कर्षः क्रियते, तथाऽज्ञातविशेषैः सह स्वावगतस्य सर्वस्य वेदार्थस्य निष्कर्षः कार्यः । अयं च निष्कर्षो विदितसकलवेदतदर्थानां विदितवेदितव्यानामधिगतयाथातथ्यानां परावरज्ञानां स्वयोगमहिमसाक्षात्कृतवेदतत्त्वा-र्थानामध्यक्षितधर्माणां महर्षीणां वाक्यैरेव कर्तुं युज्यते । तत् सिद्धं सकलवेद-शाखाप्रतिपाद्या महान्तोऽर्थराशय एकद्वशाखाश्रवणमात्रेण तुर्ज्ञाना इति स्मृतिश-ब्दाभिधेयैर्धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणैर्वेदस्योपबृंहणं कार्यमेवेति ।

मन्त्रब्राह्मणार्थवादमया ह्यनन्ता वेदाः संकीर्णा विप्रकीर्णाः कचित् कदाचिदु-त्सन्नाश्च । सांप्रतं भारते उपदशा एव वेदशाखाः समुपलभ्यन्ते । तत्र कृत्स्न-वेदिनो मन्वादयोऽहं हर्षयस्तत्तद्देशकालविशेषेषु अकृत्स्नवेदिषु संभावितस्य तत्त्वज्ञान-कर्मानुष्ठानयोर्विष्टवस्य प्रशमनार्थं स्वानुभूतान् वेदार्थान् धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराण-रूपेषु स्मृतिग्रन्थेषु यथावन्निबन्धुः । एभिरेवोपबृंहणैरनादिवाचां वेदानामर्थ-निर्णयः कर्तुं शक्यते । इमा वेदमूलाः स्मृतयस्त्रिविधाः, धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराण-भेदात् अत एवेतिहासपुराणवचनान्यभिसन्धाय “स्मर्यते च” “अपि स्मर्यते” “स्मृतेश्च” इति सूत्राणि प्राणायिषत् भगवता बादरायणेन । तत्रेतिहासपुराणे अदूरविप्रकर्षादिकस्मिन् विद्यास्थाने निविशेते । ब्राह्मणमन्त्रार्थवादमूलेषूपबृंहणेषु

धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणेषु धर्मशास्त्रं बाहुल्येन कर्मकाण्डस्योपबृंहणम्, इतिहासपुराणे ब्रह्मकाण्डस्योपबृंहणे ।

स्मृतिशब्दाभिधेयानामेषां त्रयाणां प्रामाण्यं येन युज्यते तत्रैते हेतवः, (१) एषामुपलभ्यमानश्रुतिभिः सहाविरलः संवाद उपलभ्यते, (२) श्रुतीनामिवैषामपि शिष्टमहाजनपरिग्रहः समस्ति, (३) “सहोवाच व्यासः पाराशर्यः” “यद्वै किञ्चन-मनुरवदत्तद्वेषजम्”<sup>१</sup> इत्यादिश्रुतिभिरेवैतत्कर्तृणां मनुपराशरपाराशर्यादीनामासत्त्वं ख्याप्यते, (४) ते ते स्मर्तारः स्वस्वस्मृतीः श्रुतिमूलाः प्रतिजानते । अत एभिर्हेतुभिः स्मर्तृभिरुच्यमानं स्मृतीनां श्रुतिमूलत्वं श्रद्धेयमेवेति स्मृतीनां प्रामाण्यं फलति ।

किं च, श्रुतीतरेषां मूलत्वायोगादप्येषां श्रुतिमूलत्वं सिध्यति । तथाहि— न तावदिन्द्रियमेषां मूलं भवितुमर्हति । न हि स्मृतिप्रतिपाद्येष्वलौकिकेष्वर्थेषु इन्द्रियाणि प्रवर्तितुं प्रगल्भन्ते । नाप्यनुमानं तत्र प्रवर्तितुमुत्सहते, भूयो दर्शने-नैवान्वयव्यतिरेकव्याप्त्योग्राहत्वात् तत्र प्रत्यक्षस्य निवृत्तावनुमानमपि हि निवर्तेत । नापि लौकिकं वाक्यं तन्मूलं भवितुमर्हति, तस्य प्रत्यक्षानुमानमूलत्वात्तन्निवृत्तौ निवृत्तिरेव ह्यौचित्यकोटिमाटीकते । नापि भ्रमस्तस्य मूलं भवितुमर्हति, तथा सत्येवं महाजनपरिग्रहो नोपपद्येत । नापि भावनामूलम्, अज्ञाते भावनाया अप्रसरात्, ज्ञाते भावना, भावनया स्मृतिः, स्मृत्या ज्ञानमिति चक्रककचापाताच्च । अथोच्येत श्रुत्या ज्ञाने जाते भावनोत्पद्यते, तथा च स्मृतिरिति, तर्हि स्मृतीनां श्रुतिमूलत्वमेव फलतीति समीहितसिद्धिः । तत्सिद्धं श्रुतिमूलत्वात्स्मृतीनां प्रामाण्यमविचात्यमिति ।

तदित्यं सिद्धप्रामाण्यैर्धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणैर्वेदार्थविशदीकरणरूपं वेदोपबृंहणं कार्यम्, अन्यथा “विमेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रतरिष्यती”ति प्रतिपादितो वेदप्रतारणरूपः प्रत्यवाय आपद्येत । वेदस्य प्रतारणं नाम तदभिप्रेतविपरीतार्थवर्णनमेव । तन्निवृत्तिरेवोपबृंहणस्य दृष्टं प्रयोजनम् । यदीतिहासपुराणे अननुरुध्य स्वमनोष्यैव स्वेच्छया वेदार्था विशदीक्रियेरन्, तर्हि वेदानभिप्रेता अर्था अपि वेदार्थत्वेन

१. “सहोवाच” इत्यादि । तैत्तरीयारण्यके १।८॥

२. “यद्वै किञ्चन” इत्यादि । तैत्तरीयसंहिता २।२।१०।२॥

प्रख्याप्येरन् इति संभाव्यते वेदानां प्रतारणा । एवं वेदानभिप्रेतानेवार्थान् विशदयन्तो वेदपुरुषस्य सेवका भवेन्नेत्येतदर्थं धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणैरेव वेदोपबृंहणं कार्यम् । तात्वात्वे एव यथावस्थिता वेदार्था लोकस्य समक्षमुपस्थापयितुं शक्येरन्, नान्यथा । इतिहासपुराणानुरोधेन वेदाननुपबृंहयतां स्वैरं वेदव्याख्यानं प्रवृत्तानां दृष्टयो वेदानभिप्रेतार्थानामपि वेदार्थत्वेन प्रख्यापने व्याप्रियेरन्, तथाविधा व्याख्यातारस्तदनुयायिनश्च तमोनिष्ठाः संपद्येरन्निति वेदबाह्यस्मृतिनिर्विशेषं कुट्टीरपि भगवान् मनुनिन्दति—

“या वेदबाह्या स्मृतयो याश्च काश्च कुट्टयः ।

सर्वास्ता निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमोनिष्ठाश्च ताः स्मृताः” ॥<sup>१</sup> इति ।

मनोराशयं विवृण्वद्विरभियुक्तैरपि भगवत्स्मृतिमिषेणाभ्रेड्यते—

“चित्रं विधेर्विलसितं त्विदमाविरस्ति दुष्टात्मनामयमहो किल दुर्विपाकः ।

यत् केचिदन्नभवती श्रुतिमाश्रयन्तोऽप्यर्थं कुट्टिष्टविनिविष्टधियो विनष्टाः” ॥<sup>२</sup>

“बाह्याः कुट्टय इति द्वितयेऽप्यपारं घोरं तमः समुपयान्ति नहीक्षसे तान् ।

जग्धस्य काननमृगैर्मृगतृष्णिकेप्सोः कासारसत्त्वनिहतस्य च को विशेषः” ॥<sup>३</sup>

“न्यायस्मृतिप्रभृतिभिर्भवता निसृष्टैर्वेदोपबृंहणविधावुचितैरुपायैः ।

श्रुत्यर्थमर्थमिव भानुकरैर्विभेजुस्त्वद्भक्तिभावितविकल्मषशेषोषीकाः” ॥<sup>४</sup> इति ।

“मायां न सेवे भद्रं ते न वृथा धर्ममाचरे ।

शुद्धभावं गतो भक्त्या शास्त्राद्धेहि जनार्दनम्” ॥<sup>५</sup>

इति संजयोक्तरीत्या भगवद्भक्तिमद्भक्तोपबृंहणैरेव यथावस्थितो वेदार्थोऽवगन्तुं शक्यत इति सिध्यति । मनुप्याणामल्पश्रुतत्वात्सकलवेदशाखागतवाक्यार्थज्ञानस्य दुःसंपादतामितिहासपुराणकर्तृणां मूर्खिषणामितरापेक्षया विलक्षणं महिमानं सर्ववेद-शास्त्रज्ञानं चाभ्युपयद्भिर्वेदप्रामाण्यप्रतिष्ठापकैः पूर्वमीमांसकैरपि विदितसकलवेद-नन्दनं... शेषोपबृंहणं कार्यमित्ययमर्थः स्वीक्रियते अत एव

१. “या वेदबाह्याः” इत्यादि । मनुस्मृति अ० १२।श्लो० ६५ ॥

२. “चित्रम् विधेः” इत्यादि । श्रीकूरेशचरित्रिते वैकुण्ठस्तवे ॥ १३ ॥

३. “बाह्याः कुट्टयः” इत्यादि । वैकुण्ठस्तवे १४ ॥

४. “न्यायस्मृति” इत्यादि । वैकुण्ठस्तवे १५ ॥

५. “मायां न सेवे” इत्यादि । महाभारते उद्योगपर्वणि अ० ६८ । श्लो० ५ ॥

मीमांसकमूर्धन्येन खण्डदेवेन “मन्वादीनां तु संभवति विदितसकलवेदतत्त्वार्थानां न्यायनिर्णायकत्वमिति अस्मदाद्यनुग्रहार्थं स्मृतिप्रणयनमिति सिद्धान्त्यते ।

श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणानां प्रामाण्यमभ्युपयन्त एव पूर्वमीमांसका अपि वेदानां तत्र तत्रानित्यार्थप्रतिपादकत्वान्नित्यत्वं न युज्यत इति वेदप्रामाण्यविषये बहिः क्रियमाणस्याक्षेपस्य तेषामर्थानां प्रवाहानित्यताभ्युपगमेन सुपरिहरत्वेऽपि “अभीष्टार्थव्ययेनापि जयति क्षेत्रहारिणम् । लब्धक्षेत्रैर्न दुष्प्रापः स्यादर्थ इति निश्चयात् ॥” इति न्यायेन गूढाभिप्रायेण समाधानार्थं प्रवृत्तास्तेषां वचनानां नित्यार्थप्रतिपादकत्वप्रतिष्ठितपक्षिषया इतिहासपुराणोपबृंहितवेदाभिप्रेतार्थविपरीतार्थपरतां व्याचक्षाणास्तथा वेदतात्पर्यविरुद्धान् बहून् राद्धान्तान् स्थापयन्तो वेदप्रतारणे प्रवर्तन्ते । इत्थमितिहासपुराणोपेक्षापूर्वकं स्वमनीषया वेदार्थविशदीकरणे प्रवृत्तानां वेदप्रामाण्यपक्षपातिनां पूर्वमीमांसकानामपि समापतति वेदप्रतारकत्वे, किमु वाच्यमाधुनिकानां स्वैरं पुराणेतिहासोपेक्षणेन स्वमनीषया वेदव्याख्याने प्रवर्तमानानां विदुषां शिरसि वेदप्रतारकत्वदोषः समापतति । अत्र वेदानामपार्थक्यत्वेन पूर्वमीमांसकैः कृताः काश्चिद्वेदप्रतारणाः स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेनोदाह्रियन्ते ।

(१) वेदप्रामाण्यसमर्थने प्रवृत्ताः पूर्वमीमांसकाः “न कदाचिदनीदृशं जगत्, सदा जगदित्यमेव प्रवर्तमानं वर्तते, जगतः सृष्टिस्थितिप्रलया न भवन्ति, उपनिषद्भिर्जगत्सृष्टिस्थितिप्रलयलील ईश्वरो न प्रतिपाद्यते, उपनिषदः कर्मशेषभूतस्य कर्तुरात्मनो याथात्म्यस्य प्रतिपादने तत्पराः, एतत्तात्पर्यानुरोधेनैवोपनिषदामर्थो वर्णनीयः” इति सिद्धान्तमातिष्ठमाना उपनिषदः कर्मशेषभूतात्मयाथात्म्यपरतया व्याचक्षते । इतिहासपुराणोपेक्षणपूर्वमीमांसकैः क्रियमाणमिदमुपनिषद्व्याख्यानं वेदाभिप्रेतार्थविपरीतार्थनिष्ठत्वात्तेषां वेदप्रतारकतामनक्षरमावेदयति ।

“एतद्योनीनि भूतानि सर्वाणीत्युपधारय ।

अहं कृत्स्नस्य जगतः प्रभवः प्रलयस्तथा ॥”

“ममाऽध्यक्षेण प्रकृतिः सूयते सचराचरम् ।”

“सर्वभूतानि कौन्तेय प्रकृतिं यान्ति मामिकाम् ।

कल्पक्षये पुनस्तानि कल्पादौ विसृजाम्यहम् ॥”

“थो मामजमनादिं च वेत्ति लोकमहेश्वरम् ।

असम्भूतः स मर्त्येषु सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यते” ॥

“अहं सर्वस्य प्रभवो मत्तः सर्वं प्रवर्तते” ॥

“विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूतं जगत् तत्रैव च स्थितम् ।

स्थितिसंयमकर्ताऽसौ जगतोऽस्य जगच्च सः” ॥

इत्यादीन्युपपद्यन्वचनानि तदुपपद्यन्वहितानि ।

“संयुक्तमेतत्क्षरमक्षरं च व्यक्ताव्यक्तं भरते विश्वमीशः ।”<sup>१</sup>

“क्षरं प्रधानममृताक्षरं हरः क्षरात्मानावीशते देव एकः ।”<sup>२</sup>

“क्षरं त्वविद्या ज्ञमृतं तु विद्या विद्याविद्ये ईशते यस्तु सोऽन्यः ।”<sup>३</sup>

“अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत्तस्मिन्श्चान्यो मायया सन्निरुद्धः ।”<sup>४</sup>

“मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम् ।”<sup>५</sup>

“तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरं तं दैवतानां परमं च दैवतम् ।

पतिं पतीनां परमं परस्ताद्विदाम देवं भुवनेशमीड्यम् ॥”<sup>६</sup>

“न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते न तत्समश्चाभ्यधिकश्च विद्यते ।

पराऽस्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च ॥”<sup>७</sup>

“स कारणं करणाधिपाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः ॥”<sup>८</sup>

इत्यादीन्युपनिषद्वचनानि च महता तात्पर्येण निखिलजगत्सृष्टिस्थितिभङ्गादि-  
लीलं सर्वेश्वरं क्रियासमभिहारेण प्रतिपादयन्ति । इमानि परः सहस्राण्युपनिष-  
द्वचनान्युपेक्ष्य पूर्वमीमांसकैः कर्मशेषभूतात्मपरतयोपनिषदां विशदीकरणं तेषां  
वेदप्रतारकतां स्फुटयति ।

१. “संयुक्तमेतद्” इत्यादि । श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि० अ० १ । मं ८ ॥

२. “क्षरं प्रधानम्” इत्यादि । श्वेताश्वतरे अ० १ । मं १० ॥

३. “क्षरं त्वविद्या” इत्यादि । श्वेता० अ० ५ । मं १ ॥

४. “अस्मान्मायी” इत्यादि श्वे० अ० ४ । मं १ ॥

५. “मायां तु” इत्यादि । श्वे० अ० ४ । मं १० ॥

६. “तमीश्वराणाम्” इत्यादि श्वे० अ० ६ । मं ७ ॥

७. “न तस्य” इत्यादि । श्वे० अ० ६ । मं १ ॥

८. “स कारणम्” इत्यादि श्वे० अ० ६ । मं १ ॥

९. “इतिहासपुराणस्याम्” इत्यादि । बार्हस्पत्यस्मृतौ महाभारते च ॥



(२) पूर्वमीमांसादेवताधिकरणव्याख्याने प्रवृत्ताः पूर्वमीमांसकाः

“विग्रहो हविरादानं युगपत्कर्मसन्निधिः ।

प्रीतिः फलप्रदानं च देवतानां न युज्यते ॥”

इति देवतानां विग्रहादिपञ्चकं निषेधन्तः कर्मणां कर्तृगुणभूतापूर्वद्वारा फलसाधनतां देवताप्रीतिद्वारा फलसाधनत्वाभावं चातिष्ठमानाः स्वरसतो देवताविग्रहादि-प्रतिपादकत्वेन प्रतीयमानानां मन्त्रार्थवादानां देवताविग्रहादावतात्पर्यं व्यवस्यन्तस्तदनुरोधेन मन्त्रार्थवादानर्थान्तरपरतया यद्व्याचक्षते, यत्र देवताविग्रहादिकमपलपन्ति, तत्र हेतुरितिहासपुराणानुरोधेन वेदार्थविशदीकरणे प्रवृत्तिरेव । इतिहासपुराणे अतन्त्रोक्त्यै स्वैरं वेदार्थविशदीकरणे प्रवृत्तत्वादेव ते अन्यपरवाक्य-प्रतिपादितानामप्यर्थानामबाधितत्वात्सत्यत्वेऽभ्युपगमनीये सति तेषां सत्यत्वमनिच्छन्तो देवताविग्रहादिकमपलपन्तोऽर्थनास्तिकशब्दव्यपदेश्याः समपत्सत । यदि ते इतिहासपुराणानुरोधेन वेदार्थविशदीकरणे प्रावर्त्यन्, तर्हि मन्त्रार्थवादप्रमित-मबाधितं देवताविग्रहादिकं न न्यषेधिष्यन् । इतिहासपुराणेषु देवतानां विग्रहादि-पञ्चकं प्रस्पष्टं प्रतिपादयन्ति परस्सहस्राण्युपाख्यानानि लक्ष्यन्ते । इतिहासपुराणेषु सृष्टिप्रकरणे देवतिर्यङ्मनुष्यस्थावरात्मना चतुर्विधा भूतसृष्टिर्निगद्यते, अतोऽपि देवतानां विग्रहादिमत्त्वं सिध्यति । कर्मनिमित्तकतद्देहेन्द्रियसम्बन्धनिबन्धनमेव ह्यात्मनां देवादित्वम् । न ह्यात्मनां स्वतो देवादित्वसंभवः । तथा च विष्णुपुराणम्—

“पुमान्न देवो न नरो न पशुर्न च पादपः ।

शरीराकृतिभेदास्तु भूपैते कर्मयोनयः ॥” इति ।

तथा च—

“देवान् भावयतानेन ते देवा भावयन्तु वः ।

परस्परं भावयन्तः श्रेयः परमवाप्स्यथ ॥”

“कामैस्तैस्तैर्हृतज्ञानाः प्रपद्यन्तेऽन्यदेवताः ।”

“देवान् देवयजो यान्ति मद्भक्ता यान्ति मामपि ।”

“अहमादिर्हि देवानां महर्षीणां च सर्वशः ।”

“पश्यादित्यान् वसून् रुद्रानश्विनौ मरुतस्तथा ।”

“पश्यामि देवांस्तव देव देहे सर्वास्तथाभूतविशेषसङ्खान् ।

ब्रह्माणमीशं कमलासनस्थमृषींश्च सर्वानुरगांश्च दिव्यान् ॥”

“रुद्रादित्या वसवो ये च साध्या विश्वेऽश्विनौ मरुतश्चोष्मपाश्च ।

गन्धर्वयक्षासुरसिद्धसङ्घा वीक्षन्ते त्वां विस्मिताश्चैव सर्वे ॥”

इत्येभिर्वेदोपबृंहणश्रीभगवद्गीतावचनैर्देवतानां विग्रहादिमत्त्वं विशदं प्रतीयते । एतादृशोपबृंहणोपबृंहितैः “वज्रहस्तः पुरन्दरः” “तेनेद्रो वज्रमुदयच्छत्” “तद्धोभये देवासुरा अनुबुबुधिरे ते होचुः” “इन्द्रो ह वै देवानामभिप्रवञ्ज विरोचनोऽसुराणाम्, तौ हासंविदानावेव समित्पाणी प्रजापतिसकाशमाजग्मतुः, तौ ह प्रजापतिरुवाच” “प्रतर्दनो ह वै दैवोदासिरिन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपजगाम युद्धेन च पौरुषेण च, तं हेन्द्र उवाच . . . . . त्रिशीर्षाणं त्वाष्ट्रमहनम्, अरुन्मुखान् यतीन् सालावृकेभ्यः प्रायच्छम्, बह्वीः सन्धा अतिक्रम्य दिवि प्राह्लादीनतृणहम्, अन्तरिक्षे पौलोमान्, पृथिव्यां कालकञ्जान्” इत्यादिभिः कर्मब्रह्मकाण्डस्थैर्मन्त्रार्थवादरूपैर्वचनैर्देवतानां विग्रहादिपञ्चकं स्पष्टं प्रतिपाद्यते ।

ईदृशोपबृंहणोपबृंहितश्रुतिवचनसिद्धं देवतानां विग्रहादिपञ्चकं निराचिकीर्षन्तः पूर्वमीमांसका इमांस्तर्कानुपस्थापयन्त आचक्षते—नैषां मन्त्रार्थवादानां देवताविग्रहादौ तात्पर्यम्, मन्त्राणां कर्मविधिशेषत्वादनुष्ठेयार्थप्रकाशन एव तात्पर्यम्, अर्थवादानां च कर्मविधिशेषत्वाद्विहितानां कर्मणां प्राशस्त्यबोधन एव तात्पर्यम्, अतोऽन्यपरैर्मन्त्रार्थवादैः प्रतिपाद्यमानमपि देवताविग्रहादिपञ्चकं प्रामाणिकमित्याख्यातुं न युज्यते, “यत्परः शब्दः स शब्दार्थः” इति न्यायादिति । उपबृंहणानुसारेण श्रुत्यर्थविशदीकरणे प्रवृत्ता विपश्चितो मीमांसकानामिमान् तर्कान् तर्कामासान् अभिप्रयन्त आचक्षते—कर्मशेषभूतानामपि मन्त्रार्थवादानां देवताविग्रहादाववान्तरतात्पर्यं युक्तमभ्युपगन्तुम्, कर्मसु विनियुक्ता मन्त्रास्तत्र स्वस्य तत्र किञ्चित्करत्वसंपत्त्यर्थमनुष्ठेयमर्थं प्रकाशयन्ति, इत्थमनुष्ठेयार्थप्रकाशने व्यापृता मन्त्रा देवतादिगतविग्रहादिविशेषानभिधत्वा एव तत्र किञ्चित् कुर्वन्ति । मन्त्रैर्देवतादिगते विग्रहादिविशेषेऽप्रतिपादिते देवताध्यानमेव न निर्वर्तते, न हि निर्विशेषा देवता धियमधिरोदुमलम् । अतो देवतास्मरणद्वारा कर्मसु किञ्चित्कुर्वन्तं मन्त्राणां देवताविग्रहा-

दाववान्तरतात्पर्यं नान्तरीयकं सिध्यति । एवं कर्माध्यदेवतागुणप्रकाशन-  
द्वारा कर्मप्रशंसापराणामर्थवादानां “वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता” इत्यादीनां प्राशस्त्योप-  
युक्तदेवतागुणेष्वपि तात्पर्यं सिध्यति, सतां गुणानां प्रतिपादने हि स्तुतित्वं संगच्छेत ।  
असतां गुणानां कथनेन हि अभिज्ञस्य प्ररोचना कर्तुं न शक्यते । अन्यपरवाक्य-  
प्रतिपन्नस्यापि अबाधितस्यार्थस्य प्रामाणिकत्वं ह्यभ्युपगन्तुं युक्तम् । अपि च,  
क्षणप्रध्वंसिनः कर्मणः कथं कालान्तरभाविफलसाधनत्वमिति विचारे उपस्थिते—

“लभते च ततः कामान् मयैव विहितान् हि तान् ।”

“ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति ।  
आमयन् सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया ॥”

“तमेव शरणं गच्छ सर्वभावेन भारत ।  
तत्प्रसादात्परां शान्तिं स्थानं प्राप्स्यसि शाश्वतम् ॥”

“तेषां सततयुक्तानां भजतां प्रीतिपूर्वकम् ।  
ददामि बुद्धियोगं तं येन मामुपयान्ति ते ॥”

“मच्चित्तः सर्वदुर्गाणि मत्प्रसादात्तरिष्यसि ।”

“तानहं द्विषतः क्रूरान् संसारेषु नराभमान् ।  
क्षिपाभ्यजक्षमशुभानासुरीष्वेष योनिषु ॥”

इत्याद्युपबृंहणवचनैरेतदुपबृंहितैः “वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता वायुमेव स्वेन  
भागधेयेनोपधावति, स एवैनं भूतिं गमयति” “स एनं प्रीतः प्रीणाति” इत्यादिभिः  
श्रुतिवचनैः कर्मणां देवतेश्वरप्रीतिकोषद्वारा इष्टानिष्टफलसाधनत्वमित्यवगम्यते ।  
किं च, “यज देवपूजासंगतिकरणदानेषु” इत्युक्तेर्यजधातोर्देवतापूजावाचित्वं सर्व-  
संप्रतिपन्नम् । पूजा च प्रीतिहेतुभूतः सेवाविशेष इति प्रसिद्धम् । अतः  
साक्षाद् देवताद्वारा वा यज्ञाधाराधितो भगवान् संप्रसन्नः साक्षाद्देवताद्वारा वा फलं  
प्रयच्छतीति सोपबृंहणश्रुतिसिद्धम् । विध्यपेक्षिते ईश्वरसंकरुणाम्नि द्वारे श्रुत्यैव  
समर्पिते सति अपूर्वाभिधानं किंचिद् द्वारं न करुणीयम् । विध्यपेक्षितस्यार्थवाद-  
प्रतिपन्नस्यार्थस्याङ्गीकार एव युक्तः । अत एव रात्रिसत्रे आर्थवादिकं प्रतिष्ठाख्यं  
फलं स्वीक्रियते । स्वर्गकामो यजेतेत्यादौ स्वर्गस्वरूपे विधिवाक्यप्रतिपन्नेऽपि  
तत्प्रकारजिज्ञासायां—

“यन्न दुःखेन संभिन्नं न च अस्तमनन्तरम् ।

अभिलाषोपनीतं च तत्सुखं स्वःपदास्पदम् ॥”

इत्यर्थवादप्रतिपन्नस्तत्प्रतीकारविशेषः स्वीक्रियते । तथैव प्रकृतेऽपि सोप-  
बृंहणश्रुतिसिद्धं देवतेश्वरप्रीतिकोपरूपमेव द्वारं स्वीकर्तव्यम्, न त्वपूर्वं कल्पयितुं  
युक्तम् । किं च, अन्यपरवाक्यप्रतिपन्नस्यानपेक्षितस्यार्थस्य निर्वाधत्वे तात्त्विकत्व-  
मेव स्वीकर्तुं युज्यते, अर्थवादमन्त्रप्रतिपादितस्य विध्यपेक्षितस्य निर्वाधस्य देवता-  
विग्रहादेस्तात्त्विकत्वं किंपुनर्न्यायसिद्धम् । इतिहासपुराणानुरोधेन वेदोपबृंहणम-  
कुर्वन्तः श्रुतिप्रतिपन्नान्निर्वाधान् देवताविग्रहादिकानर्थानपलुपन्तः पूर्वमीमांसकाः  
“मामयं प्रतरिष्यति” इति वचनस्य विषया भवन्तीत्यत्र न संदेहः ।

(३) “बर्हिषि रजतं न देयम्” इति निषेधस्य शेषत्वेनायमर्थवादः श्रूयते  
“सोऽरोदीत्, यदरोदीत् तद्द्रुद्रस्य रुद्रत्वम्, यदश्रु अशीर्यत् तद्रजतं हिरण्यमभवत्  
पुराऽस्य संवत्सराद् गृहे रुदन्ति यो बर्हिषि रजतं ददाति” इति । अस्यायमर्थः—  
अग्निरूपो रुद्रोऽरोदीत् तस्य तदश्रु पपात, तद्रजतं हिरण्यमभवत् अग्न्यश्रुप्रभवं  
रजतं यागे रजतं न देयमिति । एतदर्थवादोदितार्थविषये शाबरभाष्ये “कथं  
पुनरुदत्यरोदीदिति भवति ? कथं वा ऽनश्रुप्रभवे रजतेऽश्रुप्रभवमिति वचनम् ?  
पुराऽस्य संवत्सरादसति रोदने कथं भवतीति” इत्यनुपपत्तिमाशङ्क्य “गुणवादस्तु ।  
गौणा एते शब्दाः, रुद्र इति रोदननिमित्तस्य शब्दस्य दर्शनात् “यदरोदीत्”  
इत्युच्यते । वर्णसारूप्यान्निन्दन् अनश्रुप्रभवमित्याह, निन्दन्नेव च धनत्यागे  
दुःखदर्शनात्पुराऽस्य संवत्सराद् गृहे रोदनं भवतीत्याह” इति समाधीयते । तन्त्र-  
वार्तिके इदं भाष्यम् “अश्रुणश्च शौक्ल्य्याद्यदि नामैतत् कठिनं भवेत् ततो रजत-  
सङ्गं भवेदित्युत्प्रेक्ष्य तत्प्रभवनिन्दा । धनत्यागेनात्यन्तोदारस्यापि गृहबनः  
पीड्यत इति तत्सामान्याद्वा रोदनोपन्यासः” ॥ इति विव्रियते । तन्त्रवार्तिके  
शाबरभाष्ये चास्यार्थवादस्य विषये कृतेयं व्याख्या उपबृंहणाननुसारिणी कल्पना-  
मात्रप्रसूतेति यथोपबृंहणं वेदान् व्याचक्षाणानां वैदिकानां चित्तं न रजयति ।  
शाबरभाष्योल्लिखिताः शङ्का वैदिका एवं समादधते—न तावद्द्रुद्रस्य रोदनमसंभवि,  
शतपथब्राह्मणादौ रुद्ररोदनस्य सहेतुकं प्रतिपादितत्वात् । शतपथे चाष्टमूर्ति-  
ब्राह्मणे प्रथमांशे “संवत्सरे कुमारोऽजायत, सोऽरोदीत्, तं प्रजापति-

रत्नवीत्, कुमार किं रोदिषि यच्च मम तपसोऽधिजातोऽसीति, सोऽब्रवीत्, अनपहतपाप्मा वा अहमस्मि, हन्त नामानि मे देहीति, तस्मात्पुत्रस्य जातस्य नाम कुर्यात् पाप्मानमेवास्य तदपहन्ति, अपि द्वितीयम्, अपि तृतीयम्, अपि पूर्वमेवास्य पाप्मानमपहन्ति, तमब्रवीद्बुद्धोऽसीति, तस्य तन्नामाकरोत्, अस्मिन्तद्रूपमभवत्, अस्मिन् रूढः, यदरोदीत् तद्रुद्रः” इत्यादि श्रूयते । सेयं श्रुतिविष्णुपुराणे उपबृंह्यते—

“कथितस्तामसः सर्गो ब्रह्मणस्ते महासुने ।  
 रुद्रसर्गं प्रवक्ष्यामि तं मे निगदतः शृणु ।  
 कल्पादावात्मनस्तुल्यं सुतं प्रध्यायतस्ततः ।  
 प्रादुरासीत् प्रभोरङ्गे कुमारो नीललोहितः ।  
 रुरोद सुस्वरं सोऽथ द्रवंश्च मुनिसत्तम ।  
 किं रोदिषीति तं ब्रह्मा रुदन्तं प्रत्युवाच ह ।  
 नाम देहीति तं सोऽथ प्रत्युवाच प्रजापतिः ।  
 रुद्रस्त्वं देवनान्नाऽसि मा रोदीः स्थैर्यमावह ।  
 एवमुक्तः पुनः सोऽथ प्रत्युवाच महातपाः ।  
 ततोऽन्यानि ददौ तस्मै सप्त नामानि स प्रभुः ।  
 स्थानानि चैषामष्टानां पत्नीः पुत्रांश्च वै विभुः ॥” इति ।

प्रकृते रुद्रशब्दनिर्दिष्टस्याग्नेर्देवगणनिश्चितघनप्रत्यर्पणजः शोको रोदनहेतुरिति प्रमाणसिद्धम् । अतो रुद्रस्याग्ने रोदनमसंभवीति वक्तुं न शक्यते । अशरीरस्याग्नेः कथं रोदनाश्रुपातादिरिति चेत्, देवताविग्रहादेर्मन्त्रार्थवाद-सिद्धत्वाच्च कश्चिद्दोषः । तदश्रुणो रजतरूपेण परिणामो नानुपपन्नः, प्रतिनियत-वस्तुशक्तेरपर्यनुयोज्यत्वात् । दृश्यते हि द्रवादेः परिणामविशेषवशात् काठिन्यं करकादौ, तद्वत् प्रकृतेऽपि भविष्यति । गोमयवृश्चिकादिन्यायेन विलक्षणादप्यश्रुणो रजतोत्पत्तिरुच्यते । तृणारणिमणिजाम्निषु अग्निजातियोगवदश्रुप्रभवानश्रुप्रभव-रजतयोरेकरजतत्वजातियोगोऽप्युपपद्यते । शब्दप्रमाणकस्यार्थस्य शब्देतरप्रमाणेन बाधनमतिप्रसङ्गमावहेत् । द्रव्यविशेषाणां तत्तद्भातुरूपेण परिणामोऽन्यत्रापि दृश्यते । रुद्रशरीरस्य तैक्षण्यात् सर्वधातृपादानत्वमुपपन्नम् । वक्ति च भगवान् वाल्मीकिः

पार्वतीपतेर्वीर्येण ताम्रादिसर्वधातूपत्तिम् । तद्यथा—

“उत्ससर्ज महातेजः स्रोतोभ्योऽपि तदानघ ।  
यदस्या निर्गतं तस्मात्तज्जाम्बूनदप्रभम् ।  
काञ्चनं धरणीं प्राप्तं हिरण्यममलं शुभम् ।  
ताम्रं कार्णायिसं चैव तैक्ष्ण्यादेवाभ्यजायत ।  
मलं तस्याभवत्तत्र त्रपु सीसकमेव च ।” इति ।

अश्रुप्रभवं रजतं स्वकारणानुगुण्येनाश्रुपातहेतुर्भवतीति यदुच्यते, तत्रापि न काप्यनुपपत्तिः । यथा कृत्तिकान्याधानादेर्गृहदाहाद्यनिष्ठहेतुत्वम्, तथा यागे रजतदानस्याप्यनिष्ठहेतुत्वमुपपद्यते । अतो रजतदानस्यानिष्ठहेतुत्वं “वर्हिषि रजतं न देयम्” इति निषेधे तथैवोपयुज्यते, यथा अपगोरणस्य शतयातनासाधनत्वं “तस्माद् ब्राह्मणाय नापगुरेत” इति निषेधे उपयुज्यते । क्वचिन्नियतकारे फलदर्शनं तु प्रबलकर्मन्तरप्रतिबद्धत्वात्समाधानीयम् । तदेवमितिहासपुराणानु-रोधेनोपबृंह्यमाणोऽयमर्थवादस्तात्त्विकार्थपरतया व्याख्यातुं शक्यते, अस्य गुणवादाश्रयणेन मीमांसकैः कृतं व्याख्यानमुपबृंहणाननुगुणत्वादनादरणीयतामेव गाहते । किं च, रुद्ररोदनादिसंभवस्य सप्रमाणं साधितत्वाच्च “कथं पुनरुदत्यरोदीदिति भवति” “कथं वाऽनश्रुप्रभवे रजतेऽश्रुप्रभवमिति वचनम्” इति शाबरभाष्यौदितौ प्रश्नौ यथोपबृंहणं सुसमाधानाविति गुणवादाश्रयणमनुपपन्नमेव । “पुराऽस्य संवत्सराद्गृहे रुदन्ती”त्यस्य “धनत्यागे दुःखदर्शनात्पुराऽस्य संवत्सराद् गृहे रोदनं भवतीत्याह” इति व्याख्याने प्रवृत्तेन शाबरस्वामिना “धनत्यागेनात्यन्तोदारस्यापि गृहजनः पीड्यत इति तत्सामान्याद्वा रोदनोपन्यासः” इति तद्विवरणे प्रवृत्तेन भट्टपादेन च नूनमयमर्थवादः प्रहसनकोटौ निवेशित इत्येव वक्तव्यं भवति । यदि धनत्यागे दुःखदर्शद्रजतमदक्षिण्यमदेश-मित्युच्येत, तर्हि ततोऽपि प्रकृष्टस्यान्यस्य दक्षिण्यत्वेन विधानं कथं नु संगच्छेत । किं रजतादपि प्रकृष्टस्य वस्तुनो दक्षिणात्वेन दाने दातुस्तदनुबन्धिनां चाधिकं दुःखं न जायेत ? अतः कृत्तिकान्याधानादेः गृहदाहाद्यनिष्ठकारणत्वात् तात्त्विकमेव यागे रजतदानस्य रोदनाद्यनिष्ठकारणत्वमनेन वाक्येन प्रतिपाद्यत इत्येव मन्तुं युक्तम् । तत् सिद्धमस्यार्थवादस्य गुणवादमाश्रित्य मीमांसकैः कृतं व्याख्यान-

मुपबृंहणविरुद्धत्वाद्देदप्रतारणे एव पर्यवस्यति, उपबृंहणानुसारेण यथावस्थितार्थ-  
परतया व्याख्यानमेव समञ्जसमिति ।

(४) वेदे “यः प्रजाकामः पशुकामः स्यात्, स एवं प्राजापत्यं तूपरमाल-  
मेत” इत्यस्य विधेः शेषत्वेन “स आत्मनो वषामुदक्खिदत् “इत्यादिरर्थवादः श्रूयते ।  
अस्मिन्नर्थवादे प्रजापतिनाऽऽत्मवपोत्कर्तनं तस्या अग्नौ प्रहरणं ततस्तूपर-  
पशोरुत्पत्तिरित्यादिरर्थः प्रतिपाद्यते । इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां प्रजापतिर्लोकोत्तरशक्ति-  
मानवगम्यते, इतिहासपुराणानुसारेणायमर्थवादो यथावस्थितार्थपरो व्याख्यातुं  
शक्यते । लोकोत्तरशक्तिमता प्रजापतिनाऽऽत्मवपोत्कर्तनं कर्तनोत्तरमपि जीवनं  
तस्या अग्नौ प्रक्षेपस्ततः कर्मप्रभावात् तूपरपशूत्पत्तिरित्यादिकं सर्वं तात्त्विकमेव ।  
प्रजापतिर्हि अलौकिकशक्तिमानितिहासपुराणयोः प्रथते । कर्मस्तुत्यर्थमनेनार्थवादे-  
नेदं सर्वं वर्ण्यते । प्रजापतेर्वषायामग्नौ प्रहृतमात्रायामजस्तूपर उत्थितः इत्थं  
क्विल बहवः पशव उद्बभूवुः, तदिदं कर्मणः सामर्थ्यमिति कर्म स्तुतं भवति ।  
तूपरस्य प्राजापत्यत्वमप्युपपादितं भवति । इत्थमयमर्थवाद इतिहासपुराणप्रति-  
पन्नप्रजापतिमहिमानुरोधेन यथावस्थितार्थपरो व्याख्यातुं शक्यत इति सिद्धम् ।  
एवं सत्यस्यार्थवादस्य विषये शाबरभाष्ये “कथं पुनरनुत्तिवन्नायां वषायां प्रजापति-  
रात्मनो वषामुदक्खिददित्याह” इति परिचोद्य “उच्यते असद्वृत्तान्तान्वाख्यानं  
स्तुत्यर्थेन प्रशंसाया गम्यमानत्वात्” इति समाधानं “वृत्तान्तान्वाख्यानेऽपि विधीय-  
माने आदिमत्तादोषो वेदस्य प्रसज्येत” इति वृत्तान्तान्वाख्यानपक्षे दूषणं तथा  
“कथं पुनरिदं निरालम्बनमन्वाख्यायते” इति परिचोद्य उच्यते “नित्यः कश्चिदर्थः  
प्रजापतिः स्यात्, वायुराकाश आदित्यो वा, स आत्मनो वषामुदक्खिददिति वृष्टिं  
वायुं रश्मिं वा, तामग्नौ प्रागृह्णात् वैद्युते आर्बुसे लौकिके वा, ततोऽज इत्यन्नं  
बीजं वीरुद्धा, तमालभ्य तमुपयुज्य प्रजाः पशूनाप्नोतीति गौणाः शब्दाः” इति  
प्रबन्धस्यास्यार्थवादस्य गुणवादाश्रयणेन गौणार्थपरतया व्याख्यानं च यत्कृतम्,  
तदिदं सर्वमितिहासपुराणोदितप्रजापतिभावविरुद्धत्वादनादेयमेव । इत्थं कुशका-  
शावलम्बनेन व्याख्यानापेक्षया चित्रकथावस्तूनामिव मिथ्यात्वाश्रयणमेव ज्यायः, न  
हि चित्रकथायां किञ्चिदालम्बनं कल्प्यते, न वाऽऽलम्बनाकल्पने विवक्षितस्य रसादे-  
रसिद्धिः, एवमिहापि आलम्बनाकल्पनेऽपि विवक्षितं स्तुत्यादिकं सेत्स्यतीति कुश-

काशावलम्बनेनालम्बनकनमनावश्यकम् । अतोऽस्य दोषस्य परिहारयेतिहासपुराण-  
प्रतिपन्नप्रजापतिमहिमानुसारेणास्यार्थवादस्य तात्त्विकार्थपरतया व्याख्यानमेव शोभते ।  
अत एव सानुशयेन वार्तिककृता भट्टपादेनोक्तम् “मन्त्रार्थवादेतिहासपुराणप्रामाण्यात्  
सृष्टिप्रलयाविष्येते, तत्र सृष्ट्यादौ प्रजापतिरेव योगी तस्मिन् काले पुण्यकर्मोद्भवा-  
भ्युपगमेन पशूनामभावात्स्वमाहात्म्येनात्मानमेव पशुमभिनिर्माय वषोत्खननादि कृतवान्,  
ततोऽसमाप्त एव कर्मणि तृपरपशुरुत्थितः, ईदृशं च कर्म प्रत्यासन्नफलम्, एवं च  
प्रजापतिना चरितमिति सर्वं सत्यमेव, प्रतिसृष्टि चतुर्लिङ्गन्यायेन तुल्यनामप्रभाव-  
व्यापारवस्तूपत्तेर्नानित्यताप्रसङ्गः” इति । तत्सिद्धमस्यार्थवादस्य भट्टपादसंमतमुप-  
बृंहणानुकूलं पूर्वोक्तं तात्त्विकार्थपरतया व्याख्यानमेवादरणीयतां भजते, न तूपबृंहण-  
प्रतिकूलं शाबरं व्याख्यानमिति ।

(५) “आदित्यः प्रायणीयश्चरुरादित्य उदयनीयश्चरुः” इत्यस्य विधेः शेष-  
भूतोऽयं “देवा वै देवयजनमध्यवसाय दिशो न प्राजानन्” इत्यादिरर्थवादः ।  
अनेनार्थवादेन देवदिङ्मोहशमनहेतुत्वेनेष्टः स्तूयते । देवदिङ्मोहप्रतिपादकमिदं  
वाक्यमृत्विग्दिङ्मोहपरतया “कर्मसु कौशलेन दीव्यन्तीति देवा ऋत्विजः, ते  
देवयजनाध्यवसानानन्तरं दर्शपूर्णमासयोरनभ्यस्तं सौमिकं कर्मराशिमालोक्य कथ-  
मविदितं करिष्याम इत्याकुलीभावसामान्यादिङ्मोहाभिधानम्” इति व्याख्यायते ।  
परं त्वस्यार्थवादस्येदं विशदीकरणमुपबृंहणानानुगुण्यान्मुख्यार्थबाधाभावेऽपि गौणार्थ-  
वलम्बनेन प्रवृत्तेश्च यथावस्थितार्थव्यञ्जकं न भवतीत्यनादरणीयतां भजते । अति-  
शयितज्ञानशक्तीनामपि देवानां सृज्यचतुर्विधभूतान्तःपातित्वात् कर्मवश्यत्वाच्च  
वत्साहरणादौ चतुर्मुखस्येव कदाचिदुद्भूतरजस्तमोदोषवशादिङ्मोहसंभवे विरोधाभा-  
वाद्वास्तविकदेवदिङ्मोहपरत्वेनापि व्याख्यातुं शक्यते । अत्र देवानां देवय-  
जनाध्यवसानं दिङ्मोहहेतुत्वेन न व्यपदिश्यते । तथा प्रतिपादने हि अन्येषु  
दिङ्मोहानुपलम्बेन विरोधशङ्कोन्मिषेत् । किं तु देवयजनाध्यवसानानन्तरं तेषां  
कालविशेषे स्वकारणादिङ्मोहोऽभूत्, स चानेन कर्मणा शान्तिं नीतः, इत्यमिदं  
कर्म प्रशस्तम्, अतः कर्तव्यमिति किलेह विवक्षितम् । अस्मदादिविषयेऽप्यस्य  
कर्मणो मोहशमनहेतुत्वेन कश्चिद्विरोधः, न हि निवर्तनीयेन मोहेन तादात्मिकेन  
भाव्यमिति नियमः, कालान्तरे भवतः शमनमादायापि मोहशमनहेतुत्वं सुवचम् ।



इत्थमयमर्थवादो गुणवादमनाश्रित्योपबृंहणमनुसृत्य व्याख्यातुं शक्यत्वेऽपि पूर्वमीमांसकैरुपबृंहणोपेक्षणपूर्वं गुणवादमाश्रित्य व्याख्यायमानो व्याख्यातृणां “मामयं प्रतरिष्यति” इति दोषभाजनतां ख्यापयति ।

(६) “किं ते कृण्वन्ति कीकटेषु गावो नाशीरं दुहे न तपन्ति धर्मम् । आनोभरप्रमगन्दस्य वेदो नैचाशाखं मघवन् रन्धयानः” इति मन्त्रस्य स्वरस-  
सिद्धोऽयमर्थो यत्—‘हे मघवन् इन्द्र ! कीकटेषु कीकटनामकेषु देशेषु गावः  
किं कुर्वन्ति, न किञ्चिदप्युपकारं कुर्वन्तीत्यर्थः । तदेवोपपाद्यते—आशीरं  
प्रवर्ग्यार्थं पयो न दुहन्ति, धर्मं प्रवर्ग्यार्थं घृतं न दापयन्ति, घृतोपयुक्तं क्षीरं  
न प्रयच्छन्ति, तद्देशस्थानां नास्तिकत्वात् । प्रमगन्दस्य कीकटाधिपते राज्ञो  
यद्वेदो धनमस्ति, तत् अस्माकं नैचाशाखं आभर रन्धय वर्धय चेति’ ।  
अस्य मन्त्रस्यायमर्थः शबरस्वामिना “अनित्यसंयोगान्मन्त्रानर्थवयम्” इति  
पूर्वपक्षसूत्रे “कीकटा नाम जनपदाः, नैचाशाखं नाम नगरम्, प्रमगन्दो नाम  
राजा” इति शब्दैरनूद्यते । अनेन सूत्रेण प्रमगन्दराजवृत्ताद्यनित्यार्थसंयोगेन  
मन्त्राणामनित्यता प्राप्नोतीति प्रापिते पूर्वपक्षे “उक्तश्चानित्यसंयोगः” इति सूत्रं  
वैदिकानां प्रवाहानित्यकीकटनैचाशाखनगरप्रमगन्दराजाद्यर्थप्रतिपादकत्वादनित्यसंयोगः  
पूर्वाधिकरणनिर्णायकतया येन परिहृत इत्येवमर्थकं व्याख्याय सुपरिहरे सत्यपि  
अनित्यार्थसंयोगदोषवारणार्थं भट्टपादैरयं मन्त्र इत्थं क्लिष्टगत्या व्याख्यायते  
“सर्वलोकस्थाः कृपणाः कीकटाः, प्रमगन्दः कुसीदवृत्तिः, स हि प्रभूततरमाग-  
मिष्यतीत्येवं ददाति, नैचाशाखः पण्डः, तदीयं धनं नैचाशाखम्, तच्च  
सर्वमयज्ञाङ्गभूतं तेषां कर्मण्यप्रवृत्तेस्तदस्माकमाहरेति, शेषं गतार्थम्” इति ।  
एवं च वार्धुषिकादयः प्रवाहानित्या इति नानित्यार्थसंयोग इति भट्टपादस्याशयः ।  
वस्तुतस्तु प्रमगन्दराजादयोऽप्यर्था इन्द्रादिदेवतावदतुल्लिङ्गन्यायेन प्रवाहतो  
नित्या इति सिद्धान्तमास्थाय स्वारसिकार्थे स्वीकृतेऽपि अनित्यार्थसंयोगरूपदोषः  
सुपरिहरः, “सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत्” इति श्रुतेः ।

“यथर्तुष्वृतुल्लिङ्गानि नानारूपाणि पथ्ये ।

दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव तथा भावा युगादिषु ॥”

“तथाऽभिमानिनो नीतास्तुल्यास्ते सांप्रतैरिह ।  
 देवा देवैरतीतैर्हि रूपैर्नामभिरेव च ॥”  
 “यस्मिन् यो य. पुराङ्गुतो यस्मिन् देशे यथा स्थितिः ।  
 तस्य तस्यानुरूप्येण प्रजासर्गः प्रवर्तते ॥”  
 “ऋषीणां नामधेयानि याश्च वेदेषु दृश्यः ।  
 सर्वर्यन्ते प्रसूतानां तान्येवैभ्यो ददात्यजः ॥”

इत्याद्युपबृंहणवचनानां च पर्यालोचने देवानामृषीणां देशानां तदधिपती-  
 नामन्येषां च यथापूर्वं सृष्टेः सिद्धेरुपर्युक्तमन्त्रप्रतिपाद्यकोकटदेशनैचाशाखप्रमगन्द-  
 राजादीनां प्रवाहनित्यत्वे न कश्चिद्विरोधः । उपर्युक्तोपबृंहणाद्यनुसारेण  
 स्वारसिकार्थपरतया तस्मिन् मन्त्रे व्याख्यातव्ये सति क्लिष्टगतिमाश्रित्य वार्धुषिकाद्यर्थ-  
 परतया यद्व्याख्यानं कृतम्, तदुपबृंहणानुगुणत्वात्कार्पणिकत्वाच्चानादरणीयम् ।

(७) वेदे “अहल्यायै जार” इति मन्त्रेण इन्द्रोऽहल्या जारत्वेन वर्ण्यते ।  
 अस्याहल्याजारत्वरूपेन्द्रवृत्तप्रतिपादनपरत्वेऽन्तित्यार्थसंयोगः स्यादिति मन्वानैः  
 कैश्चिद्विद्वद्भिः “अहि लीयत इत्यहल्या रात्रिः, तस्या जारो जरणहेतुः सूर्यः” इति  
 व्याख्यायते । अहल्येन्द्रवृत्तान्तस्य प्रवाहनित्यतामभ्युपगम्य यथोपबृंहणं  
 स्वरसार्थपरतयैवायं मन्त्रो व्याख्यातुं युज्यते । उपबृंहणे इतिहासश्रेष्ठे  
 श्रीबाल्मीकिरामायणे बालकाण्डे अष्टचत्वारिंशे सर्गे अयमहल्येन्द्रवृत्तान्त इत्थं वर्ण्यते ।

“गौतमस्य नृपश्रेष्ठ पूर्वमासीन्महात्मनः ।  
 आश्रमो दिव्यसंकाशो सुरैरपि सुपूजितः ॥  
 स चेह तप आतिष्ठदहल्यासहितः पुरा ।  
 वर्षपूगाननेकांस्तु राजपुत्र महायशः ॥  
 तस्यान्तरं विदित्वा तु सहस्राक्षः शचीपतिः ।  
 मुनिवेषधरोऽहल्यामिदं वचनमब्रवीत् ॥  
 ऋतुकालं प्रतीक्षन्ते नार्थिनः सुसमाहिते ।  
 संगमं त्वहमिच्छामि त्वया सह सुमध्यमे ।  
 मुनिवेषं सहस्राक्षं विज्ञाय रघुनन्दन ।  
 मतिं चकार दुर्मेधा देवराजकुतूहलात् ॥” इति ।

ईदृशोपबृंहणविरुद्धं परैः कृतं तस्य मन्त्रस्य व्याख्यानं तेषु वेदप्रतार-  
कत्वदोषमासञ्जयेदेव ।

एभिः सप्तभिरुदाहरणैरिदं सुज्ञानं यदितिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदमनुपबृंहयद्भिः  
स्वमनीषया वेदव्याख्याने प्रवृत्तैर्विद्वद्भिः कथं कथं वेदानभिप्रेतार्था वेदाभिप्रेतत्वेन  
व्याख्यायन्त इति । वेदशिरसि वेदानभिप्रेतार्थारोपणनिबन्धनवेदप्रतारकत्व-  
दोषपरिहारार्थमेवेदमनुशिष्यते “इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत्” इति ।  
किं च, “किं ते कृण्वन्ति कीकटेषु गावः” इति मन्त्रमर्थान्तरपरतया व्याचक्षाणा  
पण्डितास्तस्मिन् मन्त्रे “अहल्यायै जार” इत्यत्र च शब्दसाम्यात्प्रतीयमानं  
प्रमगन्दराजाहल्यादिवृत्तान्तं श्रुत्यविवक्षितं मन्यन्ते, यथा च “अहल्यायै जार”  
इत्यादिकमन्यथा व्याचक्षते, तथैव मन्त्रार्थबादैर्वेदपूर्वभागोपनिषद्गतैः प्रतीयमानान्  
परमात्मसृज्यसुरनरतिर्यगादिविशेषतद्बृत्तान्तान् अपि वेदाविवक्षितान् ख्यापयन्तः  
पूर्वोत्तरभागगतमन्त्रार्थवादानर्थान्तरपरतया व्याचक्षीरन्निहासपुराणोपबृंहणानभिज्ञाः  
स्वैरव्याख्यातारस्ते वेदप्रतारकाः संपद्येरन्ति तत्परिहारार्थोऽयमुपबृंहणविधिः सुष्ठूप-  
पद्यते । तदिदं सर्वमभिसन्धायैव श्रीरामानुजाचार्याः श्रीभाष्ये जिज्ञासाधिकरणे  
महासिद्धान्ते उपबृंहणावश्यकर्तव्यतां समर्थयमाना बभाषिरे “इतिहासपुरा-  
णाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत् । विभेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रतरिष्यति” । इति-  
शास्त्रेणार्थस्येतिहासपुराणाभ्यामुपबृंहणं कार्यमिति ज्ञायते । उपबृंहणं नाम  
विदितसकलवेदतदर्थानां स्वयोगमहिमसाक्षात्कृतवेदतत्त्वार्थानां वाक्यैः स्वावगतवेद-  
वाक्यार्थव्यक्तीकरणम् । सकलशाखानुगतस्य वाक्यार्थस्याल्पभागश्रवणाद्दुःखगम-  
त्वेन तेन विना निश्चयायोगादुपबृंहणं हि कार्यमेव” इति । अथैतस्य विवरणं  
प्रस्तूयते ।

अत्रेदमवधेयम् । यद्यपि द्विजो बहुरूपनीतोऽपि “स्वाध्यायोऽध्येतव्यः”  
इति वेदान्तर्गतमध्ययनविधिं न जानीते, अध्ययनोत्तरं हि स ज्ञायेत । अतएव  
एतद्विध्यधीना तस्याध्ययने प्रवृत्तिर्न भवति, तथापि विध्यभिज्ञैर्हितैपिभिः पित्रादिभिः  
प्रेरितोऽथवा उपनीतानामध्ययनानुष्ठानं दृष्ट्वा स्वेनाप्युपनीतेनाध्ययनं कार्यमिति  
निश्चिन्वानोऽध्ययने प्रवर्तते । संस्कृतप्रचारदेशवासादङ्गाध्ययनबलाच्च “दर्शपूर्ण-  
मासाभ्यां स्वर्गकामो यजेत”, “यन्नदुःखेन संभिन्नं नचग्रस्तमनन्तरम् । अभिलाषोप-

नीतं च तत्सुखं स्वःपदास्पदम् ॥”, “अपामसोममृताअभूम”, “अक्षप्यं ह वै चातुर्मास्ययाजिनः सुकृतं भवति” इत्यादिभिः कर्मकाण्डवचनैः कर्मणां नित्यनिरतिशयफलकत्वे आपाततोऽवगते “ब्रह्मविद्वान्प्रोति परम्” “तमेवं विद्वानमृत इह भवति” “क्रियावानेषां ब्रह्मविदां वरिष्ठः” “तमेवं ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन” इत्यादिभिर्ब्रह्मकाण्डवचनैः कर्मकाण्डवचनैरनन्तनिरतिशयफलजनकत्वे कर्माङ्गकब्रह्मोपासनस्यापाततोऽवगते सति तन्निर्णये प्रविष्टसुखिवर्गे प्रथमप्रावण्यात् वेदानां कर्मोपक्रमात् कर्मणां निरतिशयफलजनकत्वे किं तदङ्गकेन ब्रह्मोपासनेनेति चिन्तनाच्च रागात् प्रथमतो धर्ममीमांसायां प्रवृत्तस्ततो षोडशलक्षणीत आवृत्तिविधानादिभिर्हेतुभिः कर्मणामरूपास्थिरफलकत्वं विनिश्चित्य ततो ब्रह्मोपासनस्य कर्माङ्गकस्य निरतिशयफलजनकत्वापातप्रतीत्या प्रेरितस्तन्निर्णयेच्छया ब्रह्ममीमांसायां प्रवृत्तस्ततः कर्माङ्गकब्रह्मोपासनस्य नित्यनिरतिशयापवर्गरूपजनकत्वमवधारयति । ततोऽधीयमानशाखागतेन “अनन्ता वै वेदाः” इति वचनेन वेदानामानन्त्यमवगत्य चिन्तयते अधीतशाखातोऽनवगतास्तदविरुद्धा विरुद्धाश्चार्थाः शाखान्तरेषु स्युः ते कथं नाम ज्ञायन्ताम् ? उपबृंहणैरेव तेऽर्था ज्ञातुं शक्यन्ते । किंच, “स्मृतेश्च” “अपि स्मर्यते” इत्यादिभिर्मामांसासूत्रैर्विज्ञायते वेदार्थनिर्णय उपबृंहणसापेक्ष इति । एवं चिन्तनेन प्रेरितोऽज्ञातविशेषैः सह स्वावगतार्थनिष्कर्षार्थं रागत उपबृंहणश्रवणे प्रवर्तते । तत्र पूर्वभागोपबृंहणेषु धर्मशास्त्रेषु श्रुतेषु उपनिषद्भागोपबृंहणभूतेषु इतिहासपुराणेष्वपि रागत एव प्रवर्तते माणवकः । इत्थं न्यायप्राप्तमुपबृंहणस्य कर्तव्यत्वमेव “इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत् । बिभेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रतरिष्यति” इत्यनेन विधिच्छायेन वचनेनानूद्यते । अयमेकोऽस्य वचनस्य निर्वाहप्रकारः ।

अपरस्तु—कश्चिन्माणवक एवं मन्यते यत् इतिहासपुराणे हि वेदान्तोपबृंहणे गण्येते । तयोः श्रवणं नापेक्ष्यते । यतो ब्रह्ममीमांसागताभ्यां समन्वयविरोधपरिहारपराभ्यां प्रथमद्वितीयाध्यायाभ्यामेव तत्त्वस्थितिः सुनिश्चिता । वस्तुनि विरुद्धाकारो न संभवति । अतोऽधीयमानश्रुतिनिर्णीतविरुद्धार्थप्रतिपादक उपनिषद्भागो नैव संभाव्यते । यदि तादृशः कश्चिदुपनिषद्भागः स्यात्, तर्हि वेदो

भ्रान्तजल्पितायेत । अतोऽधीतश्रुतिनिर्णीतविरुद्धार्थप्रतिपादकोपनिषद्भागस्यासंभावितत्वात्तदर्थजिज्ञासयोपबृंहणश्रवणं नापेक्ष्यते । यद्यप्यधीतशास्त्रोपनिषदनवगता अविरुद्धा ब्रह्मणि गुणविभूतिविशेषाः संभवन्ति, येषां प्रतिपादनं शास्त्रान्तरीयोपनिषत्सु संभाव्यते, तथा येषामुपबृंहणमितिहासपुराणयोः संभाव्यते, तथापि ब्रह्मगतानां गुणविभूतिविशेषाणामियत्ता इतिहासपुराणैरपि दुष्प्रतिपादा, तेषामानन्त्यात् । अवगतकतिपयगुणविभूतिविशिष्टब्रह्मोपासनेनैव पुरुषार्थसिद्धिरुपपद्यते । अतोऽप्युपबृंहणश्रवणं नापेक्ष्यते इति । एवं मन्यमानमुपबृंहणश्रवणनिरपेक्षं माणवकं प्रति “इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत्” इति वचनेनाप्रवृत्तप्रवर्तनरूपं विधानं क्रियते । अयमस्य वचनस्य द्वितीयो निर्वाहः ।

नन्वयं द्वितीयो निर्वाहो न संभवति, यतो न्यायानुगृहीतवाक्यावगतेष्वर्थेषु उपबृंहणैर्निष्कष्टव्योऽंशो नास्ति । निष्कष्टव्यः सर्वोऽप्यंशः सूत्रोदाहृतैरेव वचनैर्निष्कष्टचरः । तथा चायमुपबृंहणविधिरदृष्टार्थ एव स्यात् । विमेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रतरिष्यतीत्युत्तरार्धेन च दृष्टार्थत्वं ख्याप्यते । वेदस्य प्रतारणं नाम तदभिप्रेतविपरीतार्थवर्णनमेव । अतस्तन्निवृत्तिरूपे दृष्टफले वाचनिके फले जाग्रति अदृष्टार्थत्वं कल्पयितुं न युज्यते । वाचनिकं दृष्टार्थत्वं च दुरुपपादम्, यतोऽधीयमानश्रुतिनिर्णीते विरुद्धार्थप्रतिपादकप्रदेशान्तरसंभवे वेदस्य भ्रान्तजल्पितायमानत्वं प्रसज्येतेतिनिर्णीततत्त्वविरुद्धार्थप्रतिपादकप्रदेशासंभवेन तत्त्वविपर्ययप्रतिपादनमसंभवि । साकल्येन ब्रह्मगुणविभूत्यनवगमस्समस्ततदवान्तरविशेषानवगमश्च न वेदप्रतारणरूपतां भजते । अतस्तन्निवृत्तिरपि फलं न युज्यते इति चेत्, अत्रोच्यते—यद्यपि परतत्त्वतदुपासनप्रतिपादनेषु विपर्ययो न संभवति, तथापि “किं ते कृष्वन्ति कीकटेषु गावः” इत्यादिवाक्यप्रतिपन्नं प्रमगन्दादिवृत्तान्तं यथा शबरस्वामिप्रभृतयो मीमांसका वाक्याविवक्षितं मन्यन्ते, यथा च अहल्याजारादिवाक्यान्यर्थान्तरपरतया ते व्याचक्षते, तथैव परमात्मसृज्यसुरनरतिर्यगादिविशेषतदुत्पत्तितद्वृत्तविशेषाणामपि श्रुतिसामान्यप्रतीतत्वेन वाक्याविवक्षितत्वं मन्यमानो यदि कश्चिद् वेदपूर्वभागोपनिषद्भागगतानां मन्त्रार्थवादान् अर्थान्तरपरतया व्याचक्षीत, तर्हि सोऽश्रुतोपबृंहणतया वेदं प्रतारयत्येवेति तत्परिहारयोपबृंहणविधिरुपपद्यत इति ।

अथेदं भाष्यमनेनाशयेन प्रवृत्तं व्याख्यायते । इतिहासपुराणाभ्यामिति-  
वचनेन वेदशब्दो वेदान्तपरः । वेदोषबृंहणेषु धर्मशास्त्रेतिहासपुराणेषु धर्मशास्त्राणि  
पूर्वभागोपबृंहणानि, इतिहासपुराणान्युपरितनभागोपबृंहणानीति विभागः । तत्र  
धर्मशास्त्रेषु ब्रह्मप्रतिपादनं कर्मणां तद्वाराधनरूपत्वज्ञापनार्थम् । इतिहासपुराणेषु  
कर्मप्रतिपादनं कर्मणां ब्रह्मोपासनाङ्गत्वप्रतिपादनार्थमिति विभाव्यम् । कर्मणां  
ब्रह्माराधनरूपत्वं ब्रह्मोपासनस्य कर्माङ्गकत्वं च --

“यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।  
स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ॥”  
“ध्यायेन्नारायणं देवं स्नानादिषु च कर्मसु ।  
ब्रह्मलोकमवाप्नोति न चेहावर्तते पुनः ॥”  
“यैस्त्वकर्मपरैर्नाथ नरैराश्रितो भवान् ।  
ते तरन्त्यखिलमेतां मायामात्मविमुक्तये ॥”  
“ये तु सर्वाणि कर्माणि मयि संन्यस्य मत्पराः ।  
अनन्येनैव योगेन मां ध्यायन्त उपासते ।  
तेषामहं समुद्धर्ता मृत्युसंसारसागरात् ।  
भवामि न चिरात् पार्थ मय्यावेशितचेतसाम् ॥”

इत्यादिभिर्बचनैः सिध्यति ।

अस्मिन् भाष्ये “उपबृंहणं नाम” इत्यादिना वाक्येन “इतिहासपुराणाभ्याम्”  
इति श्लोकस्य पूर्वार्धं व्याख्यायते । अत्र “विदितसकलवेदतदर्थानां स्वयोग-  
महिमसाक्षात्कृततदर्थानां वाक्यैः” इति बहुवचनैः कपिलाख्यैकैकमतादपि इतिहासा-  
दीनां प्राबल्यं द्योत्यते । व्यक्तीकरणं नाम अज्ञातविशेषैः सह स्वावगतार्थ-  
निष्कर्षः संपाद्यः । यथा वेदेन कर्तव्यत्वेन विहितस्य सन्ध्योपासनादेः  
शरीरशुद्धिप्रकारदन्तधावनस्नानादिविशेषैः सह निष्कर्षः, एवमुपनिषद्वागेऽप्यर्थ-  
निष्कर्षः संभवति । उपनिषदर्थनिष्कर्षो ब्रह्ममीमांसासिद्ध इति नोपबृंहणापेक्षेत्यस्यां

“सकलशाखानुगतस्य” इत्यादिना वाक्येन क्रियते ।

बृंहणकार्यतोपपादकम् । उपबृंहणं नाम अनधीतशा-  
कर्षः । अतो नोपबृंहणविचारनैरेपेक्ष्यं संभवतीत्यर्थः ।

# CONCEPTION OF SARASVATĪ IN THE PURĀṆAS\*

BY

ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

[ भगवती सरस्वती वेदेषु पुराणेषु च नदीरूपेण देवीरूपेण च वर्ण्यते । ऋग्वेदे नदीरूपेण सा 'अपसामवस्तमा' ( ६६११३ ), 'सिन्धुमाता' ( ७३६६ ), 'सिन्धुभिः पितृमाना' ( ६५२६ ) 'यती गिरिभ्य आसमुद्रात्' ( ७९५२ ) इत्यादिभिर्विशेषैः संयोज्यते । देवीरूपायाश्च तस्याः 'सूनृतानां चोदयित्री' ( १३११ ), 'धीनामवित्री' ( ६६१६ ), 'ऋतावरी' ( ६६१६ ), 'वाजिनीवती' ( ७९६३ ), 'देवितमा' ( २४११६ ) इत्यादि स्वरूपमुपवर्ण्यते । द्विविधं वैदिकी सरस्वती पुराणेष्वपि नदीरूपेण देवीरूपेण च द्विधैव वर्ण्यते । नदीरूपायास्तस्याः पुराणेषु 'सरिच्छोष्ठा', 'तीर्थवरा', 'पञ्चस्रोताः', 'सागरगामिनी' इत्यादि स्वरूपं वर्ण्यते । देवीरूपा च सा 'वाग्बुद्धिविद्याज्ञानाधिदेवता' 'सर्वविद्या-स्वरूपा', 'सदम्बिका' इत्यादिरूपेण वर्ण्यते । 'ज्योतीरूपा', 'ब्रह्मस्वरूपा', 'अक्षरा' इत्यादि च तस्याः परमं रूपमपि पुराणेषु विभाव्यते, येन रूपेण तस्याः परमतत्त्वेन परब्रह्मणा सहाभेदोऽपि मतः । पुनः, यथा ऋग्वेदे सा 'घोरा' 'वृत्रघ्नी' ( ६६१७ ) 'जेषि शत्रून्' ( २३०८ ) इत्यादिरूपेणापि वर्ण्यते, एवमेव ब्रह्माण्डपुराणे सा ललितायाः शक्तिरूपेण भण्डासुरं हन्तुं तस्याः साहाय्यं कुर्वती तथा मार्कण्डेयपुराणे देवीमाहात्म्ये दुर्गायाः शक्तिरूपेण शुम्भनिशुम्भनिबहिर्णाति च प्रोच्यते । पुनश्च वागीशा देवो सरस्वत्येव शापशानेकारणैर्नदीरूपेण परिणतेत्यपि पुराणेषु बहुधा कल्पितम् । सर्वमिदं पुराणमतं वैदिक-भावानामेव विभिन्नरूपैरुपबृंहणं विकासो वेति प्रतीयते । इमां वृष्टभूमिका-माश्रित्य सरस्वतीविषयकाः पौराणिका विचाराः प्रस्तूयन्तेऽत्र । ]

\*. Amplified version of the paper read at the 21st Session of the All-India Oriental Conference ( Srinagar, Kashmir ), Oct., 1961.

The present paper is divided into the following main sections :—I. Vedic conception of Sarasvatī ; II. Transition from Vedic to Purāṇic conception ; III. Purāṇic conception—A. Sarasvatī as the Goddess of speech and learning : 1. Etymological interpretation of 'Sarasvatī' ; 2. Purāṇic accounts of the origin of Sarasvatī ; 3. Synonyms and epithets of Sarasvatī ; 4. Sarasvatī in relation to other deities ; 5. The *ghora* aspect of Sarasvatī ; 6. Anthropomorphic form or *vigraha* of Sarasvatī ; 7. Iconographical representations of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas ; 8. Sarasvatī-worship in the Purāṇas ; 9. Pantheistic and transgen-

The philosophical flight of the Indian mind in search of the ultimate reality gave it an insight which is unique in the history of religious thoughts. The innumerable gods and goddesses conceived by the Indian sages are to them nothing but so many manifestations of the same ultimate Reality—the *Akṣara Brahman* or the *Parā Śakti*. Amidst the bewildering innumerability of the gods and goddesses of the Indian pantheon Goddess *Sarasvatī* has always occupied an important and exalted place. What distinguishes man from animals is speech, intellect and super-sensuous knowledge with which he has been endowed by Nature; and as *Sarasvatī* has been conceived as the goddess of speech, intellect, learning and knowledge, her importance in the whole range of the Indian pantheon may easily be imagined.

Both in the Vedas and the Purāṇas *Sarasvatī* has been considered as one of the principal deities, sometimes even the foremost among them. The Ṛgveda calls her as the best or the greatest goddess (‘देवितमे’ II. 41. 16) and the Purāṇas make her worshipped even by the three great gods of the trinity—Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Mahēśa.<sup>1</sup> Thus the Purāṇas have assigned her a more exalted position even than that assigned to her by the Vedas. The Purāṇas have further conceived her in the double aspect—immanent and transcendent.<sup>2</sup> But the Purāṇic conception of *Sarasvatī* may be said to be rooted in her Vedic conception, both as a river-goddess and as the goddess of eloquence. Therefore, for the study of the Purāṇic conception of *Sarasvatī* a brief study of her Vedic conception also may prove helpful.

---

dent aspects of *Sarasvatī*. B. *Sarasvatī* as the River and River-goddess (to be dealt with in a future article in continuation).

Note :

(a) For the sake of facility relevant portions of the texts, specially the long portions, referred to in some of the footnotes, are quoted in Appendix I at the end of this paper.

(b) The explanation of abbreviations used is given in Appendix II.

1. Cf. BvP II. 4. 29 ; 5. 31 ; etc.

2. This double aspect of *Sarasvatī* is manifest in the *Sarasvatī-stōtras* of the Mārp (Adh. 23) and the Vārp (Adh. 32).



## VEDIC CONCEPTION OF SARASVATĪ

The place which Sarasvatī occupies in the Indian pantheon can be judged from her long life in Indian literature. From the early Vedic times she has been an object of praise and devotion. Her importance among the Vedic deities led to the creation of a corresponding male deity *Sarasvān*, conceived as the guardian of water (RV. VII. 96 4 ff.), who was later on considered in the Purāṇas as the offspring of Sarasvatī and Purūṇavas (BṛP 101.8ff.). In the R̥gveda several *Sūktās* (e.g. VI. 61 ; VII. 95 ; VII. 96) are exclusively devoted to Sarasvatī. In these *Sūktās* as well as in the various *ra-s* of some other *Sūktās* Sarasvatī has been highly enologised both as a sacred river and as a goddess.

In the R̥gvedic *Āpri-Sūktas* (I. 13 ; I. 188 ; III. 4 ; VII. 2 ; X. 110) she has been invoked along with the two other goddesses—Ilā and Bhārati (also called '*Mahī*'); and so Bhārati, Ilā and Sarasvatī together form a triad and are collectively termed as 'three goddesses' ( 'तिस्रो देवीः' ).<sup>3</sup> They may be said to form a Vedic trinity like the Purāṇic trinity of Durgā, Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī. According to the Vedic conception these three Vedic goddesses—Ilā, Sarasvatī and Bhārati—belong respectively to the terrestrial, atmospheric and the celestial sphere.<sup>4</sup> These three goddesses have allied functions. All of them are mentioned as 'of noble actions' ( 'स्वपसः' X. 110. 8) 'fit to be worshipped at the *yajña*' ( 'यज्ञियाः' I. 142. 9) ; 'awakening our intellect' ( 'चेतयन्ती' X. 110. 8) ; 'producing (or source of) happiness' ( 'मयोद्युवः' I.13.9) and 'urging us for wealth and prosperity' ( 'त्रिये' I. 188. 8).<sup>5</sup>

3. Cf. Relevant verses of the *Āpri Sūktas* quoted in the Appendix at the end of this paper.

4. Cf. Durg. on Nir. VIII. 2. 10 : 'भारती—भरत आदित्यः, सर्वभूतान्युदकेन विभक्तिं, तस्य स्वभूता भा दीप्तिः ; इडा च पृथिवीस्थाना ..... सरस्वती च मध्यस्थानैव'.

5. A symbolic or psychological interpretation has been given to Sarasvatī, Ilā and Bhārati (or Mahī) by Sri Aurobindo—'Sarasvatī represents the truth-audition, *śruti*, which gives the inspired word. Ilā represents *dṛṣṭi*, the truth-vision,.....Bhārati or Mahī is the largeness of the truth-Consciousness.' (On the *Veda*, University Edition 1956, p 110). Some scholars regard Sarasvatī, Ilā and Bhārati as three varieties of speech. (Cf. Dr. Śrīyakanta's article *Saras, Soma and Sira* in *ABORI*, XXXVIII (1957) pp. 115 ff.)

Among these three goddesses Sarasvatī has been assigned a more important place than the other two, as *Sarasvatī-Sūktas* indicate. She is treated both as the goddess as well as the sacred river. In fact, in the Veda these two aspects of Sarasvatī are often inseparable. Even in those R̥gvedic *ṛc-s* which speak of her as the 'best of the rivers' ('नदीतमे' II. 41. 16), 'mother of the rivers' ('सिन्धुमाता' VII. 36. 6), 'pure among the rivers' ('नदीनां शुचिः' VII. 95. 2), 'flowing from the mountains to the sea' ('यती गिरिभ्य आसमुद्रात्' XII. 95. 2), 'breaking the peaks of mountains by her mighty waves' ('०वारुजत् सानु गिरिणां तविषेभिरुनिभिः' VI. 61. 2) and so on, there are mentioned certain attributes of Sarasvatī, which, in fact, are not applicable to the physical river Sarasvatī; for she has also been mentioned, in the same *ṛc-s*, as 'the best of the goddesses' ('देवितमे' II. 41. 16), 'desiring' ('वावशाना' VII. 36. 6), and 'conscious' ('चेतत्' VII. 95. 2), and also as 'being propitiated by the Seer for his protection by his hymns of good praises and thoughts' ('०मवसे सुवृक्तिभिः सरस्वतीमा-विवासेम वीतिभिः' VI. 61. 2).

Hence even in such R̥gvedic *ṛc-s* the divine aspect of the Sarasvatī is more prominent than her physical or the river-aspect. In the Veda the Sarasvatī is not merely a river, but also a river-goddess or *nadī-devatā*. In course of time, the *nadī-devatā* Sarasvatī might have evolved into the *Vāg-devatā* Sarasvatī. The starting point for the conception of Sarasvatī as the *Vāg-devatā* may be traced to a verse of the Vājasaneyi-Samhitā, which says that at a sacrifice performed by the gods for heavenly cure *Aśvins*, the Physicians, gave vigour to Indra and Sarasvatī did her share as a Physician by *ṛc-s* ('देवा यज्ञमतन्वत मेवर्जं मिषजाक्षिना । वाचा सरस्वती मिषगिन्द्रायेन्द्रियाणि दधत; ॥' VS 19. 12) It is on account of this twofold Vedic conception of Sarasvatī that Sāyaṇa in his *Bhāṣya* on R̥ V I. 3. 12 remarks—'द्विविधा हि सरस्वती विग्रहवद्देवता नदीरूपा च', meaning thereby that Sarasvatī has two forms, viz. (a) a *vigraha* or anthropomorphic form, and (b) a river-form. This double conception of Sarasvatī seen further developed in the Purāṇas, as we shall see

In the Ṛgveda goddess Sarasvatī has not only been regarded as 'full of truth' ('ऋतावरी', VI. 61. 9, etc.), 'impeller of true and sweet speech in us, and awakener of our happy and noble thoughts' ('चोदयित्री सुनुतानां चेतन्ती सुमतीनाम्' I. 3. 11), 'illuminer of our entire understanding' ('धियो विश्वा विराजति' I. 3. 12), and 'full of plenitude' ('वाजिनीवती' I. 3. 10, etc.), but she has also been conceived as 'full of or accompanied by *Maruts*' ('मरुत्वती' II. 30. 8) on account of her belonging to the middle or the atmospheric region,<sup>6</sup> 'of golden path or chariot' ('हिरण्यवर्त्तनिः' VI. 61. 4), 'the virgin girl related to *Pavīravān*' ('पावीरवी कन्या' VI. 49. 7,<sup>8</sup> consort of the hero' ('वीरपत्नी' ib.), 'conquering the enemies' ('जेयि शत्रून्' II. 3. 8), 'terrible' ('घोरा' VI. 61. 7) and 'Killer of *Pitra*' ('वृत्रघ्नी' ib.). In the Veda goddess Sarasvatī has, thus, been conceived in two forms—*saumya* and *ghora*, mild and awful. The Purāṇas too conceive her in these two forms as will be discussed later.

### TRANSITION FORM VEDIC TO PURĀṆIC CONCEPTION

In course of time, however, this Vedic conception of Sarasvatī changed to some extent, and was further developed by the Purāṇas. In the Ṛgveda Sarasvatī and Bhārati are two separate deities, though performing allied functions. But in the Purāṇas Bharatī has been merged in Sarasvatī, and thus 'Bharatī' and 'Sarasvatī' have become two names of one and the same goddess (Sarasvatī or *Vāg-devatā*). Again, in the Ṛgveda Sarasvatī, though spoken as 'impelling noble speech in us'

6. Cf. Sayana on RV II. 30. 8 —'मरुत्वती मरुद्भिर्गुक्ता, मध्यस्थाना हि वाक् सरस्वती, मरुतश्च मध्यस्थानस्थाः, अतस्तद्वती ।'

7. Cf. Nir. XII. 3. 11—'पविः शल्यो भवति, यद् विगुणाति (= विदारयति) कायम्, तद्वत् पवीरम् आयुधम्, तद्वान् इन्द्रः पवीरवान् ।' Cf. also RV X. 60. 3 where the words both 'पवीरवान्' and 'अपवीरवान्' occur as attributes of *Indra*.

8. The expression 'पावीरवी' has been explained by Nir. (XII. 3. 11) as meaning *Vāk* whose *devatā* is *Pavīravān* or *Indra* (तद्देवता वाक् पावीरवी), which is further explained by Durg. as 'स इन्द्रो यस्या माध्यमिकाया वाचो देवता सा ऐन्द्री वाक् पावीरवी'

(‘चोदयित्री सुनुतानाम्’), has not been explicitly mentioned as *Vāc-* or *Vāg-davatā*. It is only in the Brāhmaṇas that we first find her identified with *vāc*. This identification is carried out to the full extent in the Aitareya and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas.<sup>9</sup> Further, in the Purāṇas she has become the full fledged goddess of speech (वाग्देवता or वाग्देवी)<sup>10</sup>, and in some places and contexts even the mere word *Vāc* or *Vāk* connotes the sense of Sarasvatī, the goddess of speech.<sup>11</sup> In the Purāṇas Sarasvatī has also been expressly mentioned as the ‘goddess of inspiration, knowledge and learning’ (‘ज्ञानाधिदेवी’, विद्याधिष्ठातृदेवता).<sup>12</sup>

According to Yaska the sound residing in the clouds is *mādhyamikā vāk*<sup>13a</sup> and DY also remarks that the thundering sound of the clouds is the *mādhyamikā vāk*.<sup>13b</sup> He explains *sarasvatī* as *udaka-vatī* taking ‘*saras*’ as a synonym for ‘*udaka*’ or ‘water’, and so he conceives Sarasvatī as the presiding deity of rain (‘वृष्ट्यधिदेवता’), and identifies her with the *mādhyamikā vāk* which is also *udakavatī*. He further says that Sarasvatī (as the *mādhyamikā vāk* and the presiding deity of rain) was also the river Sarasvatī.<sup>14</sup>

The Vāmana P. adopts this Vedic conception when it makes Vasistha eulogize Sarasvatī as ‘the goddess moving at will and producing water in the clouds’ (‘त्वमेव कामगा देवि मेघेषु खवसे पयः’ 40. 14 p). The Skanda Purāṇa (VI. 46. 28 c) also mentions

9. Cf. ‘वाग्धि सरस्वती’ (AitB 3. 2); ‘वाग्वै सरस्वती पावीरवी’ (ib. 3. 27); ‘वागेव सरस्वती’ (ib. 2. 24; 6. 7); ‘वाक् सरस्वती’ (SB VII. v. 1. 31; XI. ii. 4. 9; etc.); ‘वाग्वै सरस्वती’ (ib. II. v. 4. 6; III. ix. 1. 7); etc..—*Vide* Hansarāja : *Vaidika Kosa*, Lahore, 1926.

10. Cf. ‘वाग्देवतायाः स्तवनं’ (BvP II. 5. 1a), स्तुहि वाग्देवीं (ib. 4a); etc.

11. Cf. ‘वाचं दुहितरं तन्वीं’ (BhP III. 12. 28a); ‘उवाच वाणीं श्रीकृष्णः’ (BvP. II. 2. 58a).

12. Cf. BvP II. 5, DBhP IX. 5; etc.

13. (a) ‘वागेषा माध्यमिका.....मेघेऽधिष्ठिता’ (Nir. II. 2. 5);

(b) ‘स्तनयिलुलक्षणा माध्यमिका, साप्युच्यते इति वाक्’ (DY on Nigh. I. 11),

14. ‘यद्वा ‘सरस्’ इति ‘उदक’ नाम सत्तः, तद्वती वृष्ट्यधिदेवतात्वात्, उदकवती हि माध्यमिका वाक्, सैव वासीनदी सरस्वती ।’ (DY on Nigh. I. 11).

'*varṣā*' as one of the epithets of Sarasvatī. The VāmP even goes further in identifying all waters with Sarasvatī herself ('सर्वस्वापस्त्वमेवेति' 40. 14 c). This Purāṇic conception seems to follow the Vedic conception according to which Sarasvatī is the goddess of the atmospheric or the middle sphere.<sup>15</sup>

The Vedas, thus, have treated Sarasvatī in three aspects : (i) as the goddess impelling and invigourating our speech and intellect, and conferring happiness (*mayas*), fame (*prasaṣti*) and prosperity (*śrī*) on us,<sup>16</sup> and invoked by the Vedic Seer or *Ṛṣi* to the sacrifice, often with the two sister goddesses, Bhārati and Ilā ; (ii) as the river-goddess, also invoked by the Seer, sometimes with Indra and other gods;<sup>17</sup> and (iii) as the sacred river Sarasvatī rising from the mountains and flowing to the sea with its tributaries, and included in the group of the famous seven Vedic rivers or *Sapta-Sindhu-s*.<sup>18</sup>

The Purāṇas also treat Sarasvatī in these three aspects, but in an amplified and mythological style. In the Purāṇas these three aspects of Sarasvatī, however, are often mingled. In the Vāmana P. Sage Mārkaṇḍeya praises the Sarasvatī river as the 'mother of all the worlds' and 'the source or origin of the Vedas'.<sup>19</sup> In the Padma P. the gods, while praising Sarasvatī as the goddess of various sciences or *vidyā-s*, identify her with Sarasvatī, the sacred river (*punya-jalā*), flowing to the sea (*sāgaragāminī*).<sup>20</sup>

15. See footnotes 4 and 6.

16. Cf. RV I. 3. 11 ; I. 13. 9 ; I. 188. 8 ; II. 41. 16 , etc. (See App.).

17. Cf. RV I. 89. 3 ; VI. 52. 6 ; etc. (See App.).

18. River Sarasvatī is included among the rivers mentioned in the famous *ṛc* of the RV—'इमं मे गङ्गे यमुने सरस्वति' (X 75 5). This *ṛc* contains the names of the nine rivers, but Sāyaṇa says : 'अत्र प्रधानभूताः सप्त नद्यः, तदवयवभूता नद्यस्तिस्रः श्रूयन्ते'. The phrase 'सप्तसिन्धून्' occurs in RV. I. 32. 12, where again Sāyaṇa remarks 'सप्तसिन्धून्—इमं मे गङ्गे यमुने इत्यस्यामुष्याम्राता गङ्गायाः सप्तसंख्याका नदीः'.

19. VāmP 32. 6 p—'त्वं देवि सर्वलोकानां माता वेदारणिः शुभा ।

20. PdP V. 27. 118 f. (See App.).

Thus, we see how the Vedic conception of Sarasvatī developed into the Purāṇic conception, which, in course of time, was further amplified with various Purāṇic myths and legends.

## PURĀṆIC CONCEPTION OF SARASVATĪ

### A. SARASVATĪ AS THE GODDESS

#### 1. Etymological interpretation of 'Sarasvatī' :

The word 'सरस्वती' (*saras-vatī*) is derived from the root √वृ (गतौ—to move, glide, run, flow etc.) by adding the *upāda* suffix असुन् (अस्) to it, and then by adding to the word 'सरस्' thus formed the *taddhita* suffix वतुप् (i. e. मत्तुप्) forming the word 'सरस्वत्' (*saras-vat*), and then finally adding the feminine suffix डीप् (ई) to the word 'सरस्वत्', thus forming the word 'सरस्वती' (*saras-vatī*). The word सरस् (सरः) actually means सरणम् or प्रसरणम् (moving, gliding, flowing etc.), and as speech or *vāc* has the quality of moving or flowing out of the mouth, in the form of prose, verse etc., it has also been called '*saras-vatī*'.<sup>21</sup> Then the presiding deity of '*saras-vatī*' or *vāc* was also called '*Sarasvatī*'<sup>22</sup> or *Vāk*<sup>23</sup> (also *Vāg-devatā* or 'goddess of speech'). And as speech (*vāc*) is the great contributing factor to the acquisition of knowledge, Sarasvatī, the goddess of speech, also came to mean the 'goddess of knowledge and learning' (*jñāna-devatā* and *Vidyā-devatā*).

The Purāṇas also offer their own interpretations for several epithets of Goddess Sarasvatī. The BvP and DBhP have inter-

21. Cf. also DY on Nigh. 1. 11—'गद्यपद्यादिरूपेण प्रसरणमस्या अस्तीति'... In the Nigh. (1. 11) 'सरस्वती' is one of the 57 synonyms of 'वाक्'. In the classical lexicons also 'सरस्वती' is found mentioned as a synonym of 'वाक्' (Cf. Hem. 4. 135 a).

22. In the Purāṇas Sarasvatī is clearly mentioned as 'the presiding deity of speech' (Cf. BvP II. 1. 31; etc.), Cf. also Hem. 4. 135 b—

n Nigh. 1. 11—'साप्युच्यते इति वाक्, तदधिष्ठात्र्यपि देवता

preted four such epithets of Sarasvatī. According to the DBhP she is called (i) 'भारती', because she went down to भारत ; (ii) 'ब्राह्मी' because she is the beloved consort of ब्रह्मा ; (iii) 'वाणी', because she is the presiding deity of वाणी (speech) and (iv) 'सरस्वती', because she belongs to God सरस्वान् or *Hari* who is called 'Sarasvān' because though pervading everywhere he is particularly seen in the *saras-s* i. e. in the waters, lakes and ponds ( सरस्सु ), and also in the streams ( स्रोतस्सु )<sup>21</sup> The BvP (II. 7.2f.) has also given the same interpretation for these four epithets.

The word 'सरस्' (*saras*) secondarily means 'water' (*udaka*), which also flows ; and with this meaning in view 'सरस्वती' (*saras-vatī*) has been explained as 'उदकवती' (rich in water)<sup>22</sup> and means 'a river'. In course of time the *yaugīka* word '*saras-vatī*' acquired a *yaugarūḍha* character, and began to denote the name of the particular river Sarasvatī<sup>23</sup> which flowed through the regions of the Kurukṣetra, Puṣkara and Piabhāsa. Then the presiding deity of the Sarasvatī river was also called 'Sarasvatī', for according to the Purāṇic conception a sacred river is presided by the deity of that name. The Purāṇas also conceive the *Nadī-devatā* Sarasvatī and the *Vāg-devatā* Sarasvatī as identical.<sup>27</sup>

- 
21. भारती भारतं गत्वा ब्राह्मी च ब्रह्मणः प्रिया ।  
 वाण्यधिष्ठातृदेवी सा तेन वाणी प्रकीर्त्तिता ॥  
 सरोवाण्यां च स्रोतस्सु सर्वत्रैव हि दृश्यते ।  
 हरिः सरस्वान् तस्यैयं तेन नाम्ना सरस्वती ॥ (DBhP IX. 7. 2,8)  
 BvP reads the last two lines as follows :  
 सर्वं विश्वं परिख्याप्य स्रोतस्यैव हि दृश्यते ।  
 हरिः सरस्सु तस्यैयं तेन नाम्ना सरस्वती ॥ (BvP II. 7.9).

22. cf. 'सरस्वती—सर इत्युदकनाम सत्तैस्तद्धती' (Nir. IX. 8 5). Also see *fo.* 14.

23. Dr. Suryakant identifies the Sarasvatī river with the *Aṁsumati*, and takes the words '*saras*' and '*amṣu*' to mean *Soma*. According to him, therefore, '*Sarasvatī*' means 'rich in *Soma*, and not rich in water.' It was the river on whose banks great soma-sacrifices were performed. cf. his article '*Saras, Soma and Sira*' in *ABORI XXXVII* (1957) pp. 115 ff.

27. Dr. Muir (the author of the '*Hindu Pantheon*') endeavours to account for the identification of the river-goddess Sarasvatī with *Vāk*, or *Sara-*

Thus the word '*Sarasvatī*' in the Purāṇas stands for (i) *vāk* or speech, (ii) *Vāg-devatā* or the presiding deity of speech (also conceived as *Buddhi-devatā*, *Jñāna-devatā*, *Vidyā-devatā*, *Śāstra-devatā* etc.), (iii) a river, (iv) the particular river *Sarasvatī*, and (v) the presiding deity of the *Sarasvatī* river, who is taken as identical with *Sarasvatī*, the presiding deity of speech, intellect and knowledge.

## 2. Purāṇic accounts of the origin of *Sarasvatī* :

Various accounts of the origin (*samudbhava*) of Goddess *Sarasvatī* are found in the Purāṇas. These mythological accounts are in most cases allegories, and form, so to say, symbolical sheaths covering important cosmological and psychological truths, only to be discovered and expounded by advanced devotees of *Sarasvatī*.

The main accounts of the origin of *Sarasvatī*, as they are given in the different Purāṇas, are noted below, without endeavouring to suggest their esoteric interpretation :

(1) According to the BvP and the DBhP—Goddess *Sarasvatī* is one of the five main forms which the *Mūla Prakṛti* (the Primordial Nature) or the *Śakti* of *Brahman* assumes at the time of creation of the universe according to the different functions of creation. For the purpose of creation the *Atman* assumed two forms—His right half was the Male and the left half is known as *Prakṛti*. Due to the desire of Śrī Kṛṣṇa (= *Para-Brahman*) *Prakṛti* assumed five forms, viz. *Durgā* (the mother of *Gaṇeśa*), *Rādā*, *Lakṣmī*, *Sarasvatī* and *Sāvitrī*.<sup>38</sup>

*svatī*, the goddess of speech. He says "When once the river had acquired a divine character it was quite natural that she should be regarded as the patroness of the ceremonies which were celebrated on the margin of her holy waters, and that her direction and blessing should be invoked as essential to their proper performance and success. The connection into which she was thus brought with sacred rites may have led to the further step of imagining her to have an influence on the composition of the hymns which formed so important a part of these proceedings, and of identifying her with *Vāk*, the goddess of speech." (Quoted in *ODHM*, p. 284).

38. BvP II. 1. 1 ff; 4. 4; DBhP IX. 1. 1 ff; 4. 4. (App.)



(2) Another account of the origin of Sarasvatī is also found in these two Purāṇas (BvP and DBhP) :—From the tip of the tongue of the *Śakti* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa there appeared suddenly, in the course of the creation of the universe, a white-coloured and beautiful girl (*Kuṇyā*), wearing yellow garments, decorated with jewels, and bearing a lute and a book (‘वीणापुस्तकधारिणी’); she was *Sarasvatī* or *Vāṇī*, the presiding deity of all the *sāstras* (‘सर्वशास्त्राधिदेवता’). Then again the *Śakti* or *Yogit* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa assumed two forms, her left half was *Kumalā* and the right half was *Radhā*.<sup>29</sup>

This account appears to be another version of the previous account in the Purāṇic style.

(3) The Vāyu Purāṇa contains the following account :—From the concentrated anger of Brahmā a *Puruṣa* was produced; his body was half male and half female (‘अर्धनारीनखतुः’), he was *Śaṅkara*. Brahmā asked him to divide his body; so he divided his body, the male and the female portions of his body became separated into a Male and a Female. The Male was again asked by Brahmā to divide himself, and he divided himself into eleven Rudras. The right half of the Female was white, and the left half was black. She was also asked by Brahmā to divide her body, and so she divided her body, the white part and the black part of her body became separated into two forms—white and black. *Sarasvatī* is one of the various manifestations of the white form (known as *Gaurī*).<sup>30</sup>

(4) The Vāyu Purāṇa contains also another account : When the thirty-third *Kāṇḍa* called *Viśvarūpa* started, Brahmā thought of creating the world; so he desired for an offspring; he meditated, and from him appeared Sarasvatī containing all forms (‘विश्वरूपा’) and roaring loudly (‘महानादा’). She was the offspring of Brahmā (‘स्वयंभुवः प्रसूतिः’), and appeared in the form of a *gau* having four mouths, four horns, four teeth, four eyes,

29. BvP II. 2. 54 ff.; DBhP IX. 2. 54 ff. (App.)

30. VP I. 9. 67 ff.; Also cf. ViṣP I. 7, 10ff. (App.)

and also four hands. This *gau* was no other than the *Prakṛti*, the source of the universe ( जगद्योनिः ).<sup>31</sup>

(5) According to the account given in the *Lalitopākhyāna* portion of the *Brahmāṇḍa P.* Goddess *Mahālakṣmī* (also called *Kāmākṣī* or *Tripurasundarī*) produced three eggs. *Girā* (i. e. *Sarasvatī*) was born along with *Śiva* from one of these three eggs. From the other two eggs two more pairs were born, viz. *Ambikā* and *Viṣṇu* from the one egg, and *Śrī* and *Brahmā* from the other. Goddess *Mahālakṣmī*, then combined *Sarasvatī* with *Brahmā*, *Ambikā* (*Pārvatī*) with *Śiva*, and *Śrī* (*Lakṣmī*) with *Viṣṇu*.<sup>32</sup>

(6) A paralld account is given in the *Prādhānika Rahasya* appended to the *Devī-Māhātmya* of the *Mārkaṇḍeya P.* Goddess *Mahālakṣmī*, endowed with three *guṇas*, assumed also a *tāmasika* form known as *Mahākālī*, and also a *sāttvika* form known as *Sarasvatī* (= *Mahāsarasvatī*). Each of these three goddesses—*Mahālakṣmī*, *Mahākālī* and *Sarasvatī* or *Mahāsarasvatī*—is said to have four hands (*caturbhujā*). These goddesses created three pairs of deities, each creating one pair; thus :

*Mahālakṣmī* created *Brahmā* and *Śrī* (*Lakṣmī*)

*Mahākālī* created *Rudra* and *Trayī* (*Sarasvatī*) ;

*Mahāsarasvatī* created *Viṣṇu* and *Umā* (*Gaurī*)

*Mahālakṣmī*, then, gave *Trayī* (*Sarasvatī*) to *Brahmā* as his wife ( पत्नी ), *Gaurī* (*Umā*) to *Rudra* and *Śrī* to *Vāsudeva*.<sup>33</sup>

This account of the creation of the three pairs of deities tallies with the account of the *Lalitopākhyāna* given above. In both of these accounts *Sarasvatī* and *Śiva* are said to have been born together from the same source.

(7) According to the *Matsya P.* (Adh. 3) *Sarasvatī* is the body-born ( देहसंयुता ) daughter of *Brahmā*. When *Brahmā* desired to create the Universe he meditated, and then his body was divided into two halves, the one half was male, and the other

31. VP I. 28. 84 ff. (App.)

32. BdP IV. 40. 5 ff (App.)

33. See the relevant text of the *PrādhR* quoted in the Appendix.

half was female. This female was goddess Sarasvatī or Bhārati. Being born from his own body Brahmā considered her as his daughter (आत्मजा).<sup>84</sup>

Besides the Matsya P., Bhāgavata, Brahmāṇḍa, Brahma, Padma and Skanda also mention Sarasvatī as Brahmā's daughter.<sup>85</sup>

### 3. Synonyms and epithets of Sarasvatī

Several synonyms and epithets of Goddess Sarasvatī are mentioned in the Purāṇas. Some of them indicate her symbolic and psychological aspects, some denote her cosmic and divine aspect, and some also point to her transcendent aspect. The study of these synonyms and epithets also may give us an idea regarding the conception of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas.

#### (a) *Synonyms of Sarasvatī :*

(i) According to the Matsya P. the body-born daughter of Brahmā is called *Satarūpā*, *Sāvitrī*, *Sarasvatī*, *Gāyatrī* and *Brahmāṇī* :

‘शतरूपा च सा ख्याता सावित्री च निगद्यते ॥

सरस्वत्यथ गायत्री ब्रह्मणी च परंतप ।’ (MP 3. 31u, 32p)

(ii) The Padma P. gives six synonyms of Sarasvatī, viz. *Mati*, *Smṛti*, *Prajāñā*, *Medhā*, *Buddhi* and *Girā* (i. e. *Vāk*) .

‘मतिः स्मृतिस्तथा प्रज्ञा मेधा बुद्धिर्गिरा शुभा ॥

सरस्वत्याः सुपर्यायाः षडेते परिकीर्त्तिताः ।’<sup>86</sup>

(PdP. V. 18. 217u.-218p).

(iii) The *Prādhānika-Rahasya* mentions several synonyms or epithets of Sarasvatī (i. e. Mahāsarasvatī, who was a *sāttvika* form of Mahālakṣmī) as follows :

84. MP 3. 30 ff. (App)

85. Cf. BhP. III. 12. 28 ; BdP III 35. 44 ; BrP 101. 4 ; 102. 2f. ; PdP V. 18. 163 ff. ; V. 37. 79 f. ; SkP VII. 33. 16f., 20f. ; 35. 17 ; etc.

86. In the Skanda P. these six names are mentioned as belonging to the attendants (*Upāsikās*) of Sarasvatī :

मतिः स्मृतिस्तथा प्रज्ञा मेधा बुद्धिर्गिरा वरा ॥

उपासिकाः सरस्वत्याः षडेते प्रस्थितास्तदा ॥

(SkP VII. 35. 28u-29p)

‘महाविद्या महावाणी भारती वाक् सरस्वती ।

आर्या ब्राह्मी कामधेनुर्वेदगर्भा च धीश्वरी ॥’ (Śl. 16)

But the goddess who was created along with Śiva by Mahākālī is called *Trayā*, *Vidyā*, *Kāmadhenu*, *Bhāṣā*, *Akṣarā* and *Svarā* :

त्रयो विद्या कामधेनुः सा स्त्री भाषाऽक्षरा स्वरा ।’

which are definitely the synonyms of *Sarasvatī* who is here differentiated from *Mahāsarasvatī*.

(iv) The name ‘*Sārādā*’ has also been used for *Sarasvatī* by the Skanda P. (VII. 33. 87d). According to the *Sarasvatī-Rahasya-Upaniṣad*, however, *Sārādā* is the name of a particular form of goddess *Sarasvatī*, residing in Kashmir :

‘नमस्ते शारदे देवि कार्मवीर्यपुरवासिनि’

These and similar other synonyms of *Sarasvatī* are found mentioned in the several other Purāṇas also. All these synonyms may be divided into the following categories :

(i) Speech-synonyms—such as वाक्, वाणी, गिरा, भारती, सरस्वती, भाषा, अक्षरा, स्वरा, रसना (SkP VI. 46. 29b) ; etc. ;

(ii) Psychological synonyms—such as मति, बुद्धि, प्रज्ञा, मेधा, स्मृति, etc. ;

(iii) synonyms of knowledge—such as विद्या, महाविद्या, त्रयी, etc.

(iv) synonyms denoting her cosmic aspect—such as शतरूपा (MP), विश्वरूपा, (VP), शारदा (SkP), etc.

(v) Those indicating her divine character or her association with a god—such as ब्रह्मसुता, ब्राह्मी, ब्रह्माणी, सावित्री etc.

(b) *Epithets and attributes of Sarasvatī* :

It has been stated before that the Rgveda has used ‘अृतावरो’, ‘वाजिनीवती’, सरस्वती’, ‘द्विरयवत्तनिः’, ‘पावीरवी’, ‘बृवन्ती’ etc. as the epithets of *Sarasvatī*. The Purāṇas have also mentioned a large number of epithets and attributes of *Sarasvatī* which may throw ample light on the Purāṇic conception of *Sarasvatī*. These are briefly given below :

(i) *Attributes relating to speech :*

वाग्देवी, वाग्देवता, वाग्वादिनी, वर्णविदेवी, सर्ववर्णस्मिका, सर्वकण्ठवासिनी, बिह्वाम्नासिनी, कविजिह्वाम्नासिनी, गद्यपद्यवासिनी (BvP II. 4, 5), शब्दवासिनी (MP 66. 11b, v. 1.) वागीशा (BrP 101. 11), महावाणी (PrādhR), etc.

(ii) *Attributes relating to mental faculties and functions :*

स्मृतिशक्ति, ज्ञानशक्ति, बुद्धिशक्तिस्वरूपिणी, कलानाशक्ति, प्रतिभा, विचार-कारिणी—(BvP II. 4, 5) ; मनस्विनी, धृति, मेधा, भक्ति, वृष्टि, रति, प्रीति, लजा, शान्ति, स्मृति, दक्षा, क्षमा—(SkP VI. 46) ; श्रद्धा, परा निष्ठा, सिद्धि—(PdP. V. 28, 116) ; etc.

(iii) *Attributes relating to knowledge and learning :*

विद्या, महाविद्या, त्रयी, वेदगर्भा—(PrādhR) ; त्रयोविद्या (PdP V. 27. 118c) ; वेदारणि (VāmP 32, 6) ; श्रुति, कला—(SkP VI. 46, 28) ; विद्याधिदेवता, सर्वविद्याधिदेवी, विद्यास्वरूपा, सर्वविद्यास्वरूपा, ज्ञानाधिदेवी, बुधजननी, सर्वशास्त्रवासिनी, सर्वशास्त्राधिदेवता, पुस्तकवासिनी, ग्रन्थबीजरूपा, ग्रन्थकारिणी, व्याख्यास्वरूपा, व्याख्याधिष्ठातृदेवता, त्रयसिद्धान्तरूपा, विषयज्ञानरूपा, सर्वसंगीत-संघानतालकारणरूपिणी, वीणापुस्तकधारिणी—(BvP II. 1-7) ; etc.

(iv) *Attributes relating to her cosmic aspect :*

शतरूपा (MP), विश्वरूपा (VP), सर्वलोकानां माता (VāmP 32-6), जगद्धात्री (MārP 23.30) ; जगन्माता, जगदम्बिका, सदम्बिका, शक्तिरूपिणी—(BvP II. 4, 5) ; सर्वभूतनिवासिनी, क्षिति, कृषि, वृष्टि—(SkP VI. 46) ; संख्या, रात्रि, प्रभा, भूति—(PdP V. 28, 117). सिनीवाली, कुहू, राका—(SkP. VI. 46. 27) ; प्रकृति, जौ—(VP I. 23. 50) ; etc.

(v) *Attributes relating to her divine aspect :*

देवी, सुरेश्वरी, ब्रह्मास्वरूपा, ज्योतीरूपा, सनातनी, अच्युता—(BvP II. 1-7) ; महेश्वरी (VP) ; ब्रह्मयोनि (MārP 23, 30) ; ब्रह्मावासिनी MP 66. 11b, देवमाता (SkP VI. 45. 27 ; VII.34. 36 ; 35. 103) ; लक्ष्मी, गौरी, शिवा, ब्रह्माणो, वाम्नायरी, देवेशी, स्वधा, स्वाहा, गङ्गा, अदिति, सावित्री, गायत्री, विनता, कद्रू, रोहिणी, सिनीवाली, कुहू, राका—(SkP VI. 46) ; etc.

(vi) *Other attributes :*

कीर्ति, निद्रा, क्षुधा, पुष्टि, वसुःप्रीति, सख्य, धर्म, बला, नाडी—(SkP VI. 46) ; अर्पा, कामवेनु—(PrādhR) ; etc.

It need not be said that the above list of the attributes of Sarasvatī is not exhaustive. Still, this list gives us a fair idea of the Purāṇic conception of the nature and functions of Goddess Sarasvatī, and also of the important position which has been assigned to her in the Purāṇas.

#### 4. Sarasvatī in relation to other deities

The relation of Sarasvatī with the Vedic deities *Bhāmā* and *Ilā* has already been discussed under the head 'Vedic conception of Sarasvatī'. In the Purāṇas too she has been associated with some of the important Purāṇic deities.

(1) **Sarasvatī and Brahmā :** In the Purāṇas the relation of Sarasvatī with Brahmā is of three kinds—(a) Sarasvatī as the virgin daughter of Brahmā, (b) Sarasvatī as the consort or spouse of Brahmā, and (c) Sarasvatī as residing in the mouth of Brahmā (in a figurative sense). The Matsya and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas have treated her both as the daughter as well as the spouse of Brahmā. Some Purāṇas, such as the Brahma, Padma and the Skanda have treated her only as the virgin daughter (कुमारी, कन्या) of Brahmā, while some Purāṇas, such as the BvP and the DBhP treat her as the spouse of Brahmā. The BdP mentions her as the daughter of Brahmā (ब्रह्मपुत्रा ; III. 35. 44 ) ; but in the *Lalitopākhyāna* of the BdP Sarasvatī is said to be united with Brahmā as his spouse by Goddess Mahālakṣmī.

(a) *Sarasvatī as the daughter of Brahmā :* As has already been stated, the Matsya mentions her as being produced from the body of Brahmā. BvP, PdP and SkP merely mention her as the virgin daughter (*Kumārī*, *Kanyā*) of Brahmā. (*vide* Section on the origin of Sarasvatī).

(b) *Sarasvatī as the spouse of Brahmā :*

(i) The Matsya P. says that when Brahmā looked at his body-born daughter Sarasvatī, his heart was captured by her extreme beauty, and in spite of her unwillingness, Brahmā made her his spouse and remained mated with her in the lotus-temple for a hundred divine years ; and out of this union

*Śrāyambhuva* Manu was born.<sup>87</sup> The epithet *Brahmāṇī* for *Sarasvatī* (MP 3.32 b; SkP VI. 46.) also supports this Purāṇic account.

(ii) According to BvP—When *Sarasvatī* was produced from the tip of the tongue of the *Sakti* or *Yogit* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, he gave her to God Nārāyaṇa (the *Utturbhuja* from of Śrīkṛṣṇa) as his wife. But once *Sarasvatī* picked up a quarrel with her co-wife Gaṅgā, and so Nārāyaṇa transferred *Sarasvatī* to *Brahmā*, and Gaṅgā to Śiva.<sup>88</sup>

(iii) According to the *Laṭitopākhyāna* and the *PrādhR* *Sarasvatī* was given to *Brahmā* as his wife by *Mahālakṣmī*.<sup>89</sup>

(c) *Sarasvatī as residing in the mouth of Brahmā* :

The conception of *Sarasvatī* as residing (in a metaphorical sense, of course) in the mouth of *Brahmā* is also found in several Purāṇas. In the PdP Viṣṇu praises *Sāvitṛī* as *Śarasvatī* residing in the mouth of *Brahmā* ('ब्रह्मास्ये तु सरस्वती' V. 29. 216 b). and in the MP *Gaurī* is also praised in the same words as 'ब्रह्मास्येषु सरस्वती' (MP 13. 52b). These are, however, indirect references to the conception of *Sarasvatī* living in the mouths of *Brahmā*. The *Sarasvatī-Rahasya Up.* contains a direct reference to this conception when it plays *Sarasvatī* as : 'चतुर्मुखमुखाभोजवन-हंसवधूमन । मानसे रमतां नित्यं सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती ॥',

(2) *Sarasvatī and Viṣṇu* : In the Purāṇas *Sarasvatī* has been conceived as (a) the wife of *Viṣṇu*, (b) the offspring of *Viṣṇu*, and (c) the tongue of *Viṣṇu*.

(a) *Sarasvatī as the wife of Viṣṇu* : According to the BvP. (II. 6) and DBhP (IX. 6) *Sarasvatī* had been at first the wife (भार्य) of Nārāyaṇa or *Viṣṇu*, as has already been stated before. This conjugal relation between *Sarasvatī* and *Viṣṇu* is rarely found mentioned elsewhere in the Purāṇas.

87. MP. 3.53-44. (See App.)

88. BvP II, 2. 54 ff; II. 6, ('ब्रह्मणः कामिनी भव' II. 6. 58 b); DBhP IX (corresponding portions).

89. Cf. BdP IV. 40. 7a—'सरस्वत्या पितामहम्' (महालक्ष्मीयोजयामास), and PrādhR 26p 'ब्रह्मणो प्रददौ पत्नीं महालक्ष्मीर्नृप त्रयीम् ।'

(b) *Sarasvatī as the offspring of Viṣṇu*: The SkP mentions Viṣṇu as the 'cause of being' (कारण) of Sarasvatī.<sup>40</sup> In the ṚV (VI. 49. 7) she has been mentioned as the virgin girl related to *Puṣṭravān* or Indra (पावीरवी कन्या). Thus in the ṚV the relation between Indra and Sarasvatī had already been established. In the Purāṇas Viṣṇu is also termed as *Upendra* (the younger brother of Indra), for Viṣṇu in his *Vāmana*-incarnation was born as the son of Aditi, the mother of Indra. So it is just possible that the Vedic relation between *Indra* and his *Kanyā* Sarasvatī might have been developed into the relation (of progenitor and offspring) between *Upendra* (Viṣṇu) and *Sarasvatī*.

(c) *Sarasvatī as the tongue of Viṣṇu*: The conception of Goddess Sarasvatī as being 'the tongue of Viṣṇu' gained popularity in the Epics and the Purāṇas. The Matsya P. says that when God *Vāmana* assumed the cosmic form *Satyā* became his speech and Goddess Sarasvatī became his tongue ('सत्यं तस्याभवद् वाणी जिह्वादेवी सरस्वती' MP 246. 57). The *Vāmana* P. also calls Sarasvatī as 'the tongue of Viṣṇu' ('विष्णोर्जिह्वा सरस्वती' VāmP 32. 23). In the *Brahma* P. Viṣṇu is spoken as 'holding Sarasvatī in his mouth' ('बिभ्रत् सरस्वतीं वक्त्रे' BrP. 122. 71c).

In the *Rāmāyaṇa* Brahmā says to Rāma, 'O Rāma, I am thy heart, and Goddess Sarasvatī is thy tongue' ('अहं ते हृदयं राम जिह्वा देवी सरस्वती' Rām. VI. 120. 24). In the *Mahābhārata* Brahmā praises Vāsudeva or Viṣṇu in his cosmic form as—'The earth is thy feet, directions thy arms, *diva* (sky) thy head, I thy form, gods thy body, the moon and the sun thy eyes.....Aśvins thy ears and Goddess Sarasvatī is thy tongue'. ('पादौ तव धरा देवी दिशो बाहू दिवं शिरः । सूक्ष्मस्तेऽहं सुरा कायश्चन्द्रादित्यौ च चक्षुषी ॥.....अश्विनौ श्रवणौ नित्यं देवी जिह्वा सरस्वती ।' Mbh. VI. 95. 59-61).

(3) *Sarasvatī and Siva*: It has been already said that according to the *Lalitopākhyāna* Sarasvatī was born along with

॥ देवी वाङ्मेवाग्निना तदा ।

गणमात्मानं विष्णुं कमललोचनम् ॥ (SkP, VII. 33. 96)



Śiva from one of the eggs produced by Goddess Mahālakṣmī, and according to the *Prādhā*, also Sarasvatī was created along with Śiva by Goddess Mahākālī. This conception of the association of Sarasvatī with Śiva seems to be borrowed from the *Tantras*, for both these works are of the Tāntric nature.

Again, in the RV Sarasvatī has been spoken as *Maruṭvatī*. (II. 30. 8) and *Maruṭsakṣā* (VII. 96. 2) The *Maruṭs* are regarded as the sons of Rudra in the RV.<sup>41</sup> In the *Brāhmanas* and the *Upaniṣads* also *prāṇas* are identified with *Rudras*,<sup>42</sup> and the Liṅga Purāṇa also identifies *prāṇas* with *Rudras*.<sup>43</sup> Thus the Purāṇic (or rather the Tāntric) conception of Sarasvatī as associated with Śiva or Rudra may be traced back to the Ṛgveda.

(4) **Sarasvatī and Śatarūpā** : In the Vāyu P. (I. 23. 24) Sarasvatī has been mentioned as *Viśvarūpā* (containing all forms within her) ; '*Śatarūpa*' also is the original Female Principle of the universe, containing hundred (i. e. innumerable) forms within her, she is also called *Satendriyā* (MP. 4. 24 a). Sarasvatī as *Viśvarūpā* has been regarded as the *Prakṛti-Gau*, the source of the universe ('जगद्योनिः' *ib.* śl. 50). Śatarūpā also has been spoken as producing *Rṣis*, *Prajāpatis*, and *Manus* such as *Svāyambhuva* and others (PdP. V. 16. 11f.). She has been identified with Sāvitrī in the Padma P. ('शतरूपा च या नारी सावित्री सा त्विहोच्यते' *ib.* 10u) and with Sāvitrī and Sarasvatī in MP. (3. 31 f.). Śatarūpā, thus identified with Sāvitrī and Sarasvatī both, has been mentioned as the spouse of Brahmā both in the Padma P. (V. 16. 11 a) and the Matsya P. (3. 43p), and the mother of *Svāyambhuva* Manu ('जननी या मनोर्देवी शतरूपा शतेन्द्रिया' MP. 4. 24u ; 'स्वायम्भुवादींश्च मनून् सावित्री समजोजन्तु' PdP. V. 16. 12 p).

But elsewhere in the Padma P. (V. 3. 169 f.) and also in the several other Purāṇas Śatarūpā has been mentioned as the

41. cf. 'युवा पिता स्वपा ह्य एषां सुदुष्पा वृश्निः सुविना मरुद्भ्यः' (RV. V. 80.5).

42. cf. 'कतमे ह्यद्रा इति, दशमे पुरुषे प्राणा आत्मैकादशः' (SB. XI. vi. 3. 7); and 'प्राणा वाव ह्यद्राः' (ObUp. III. 16. 3).

43. 'ये ह्यद्रास्ते खलु प्राणा ये प्राणास्ते तदात्मकाः' (LīP. I. 22. 24u)

wife of Manu *Svāyam̐huva*, who gave birth to two sons—*Priyavrata* and *Uttānapāda*.<sup>44</sup> Śatarūpa is spoken as '*ayoniṣā*' (BrP 2. 1 ; VP I. 10. 12 ; LiP I. 5. 16 ; etc.) and as '*bhūtaadhārī*' (VP I. 10. 8). *Sarasvatī*, being born from the body of *Brahmā* is also *ayoniṣā* ; she is also spoken as '*sarvabhūtaadhārā*' (ib 23. 85) in the form of *Prakṛti-Gaṇa*. Moreover, in the *Mahābhārata* *Sarasvatī* also is mentioned as the wife of Manu.<sup>45</sup> So, as Manu's wife too, both Śatarūpa and *Sarasvatī* seem also to be identified.

(5) **Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī and Gāyatrī** : These three goddesses are often associated in the Purāṇas as follows—

(a) In the MP (Adhs, 3, 4) *Sarasvatī*, *Sāvitrī* and *Gāyatrī* are mentioned as identical, being the names of the body-born daughter of *Brahmā*. In the account of the *Sārasvata-Vrata* as given in MP (Adh 66) and PdP (V. 22. 176-194) *Sarasvatī* and *Gāyatrī* are the names of the same goddess (i.e. *Sarasvatī*). Again, in the *Sarasvatī-stotra* of the SkP (VI. 46) *Gāyatrī* and *Sāvitrī* are both mentioned as synonyms of *Sarasvatī*.

(b) *Sarasvatī*, *Sāvitrī* and *Gāyatrī* are also conceived as three separate goddesses in some of the Purāṇas. (i) In the BrP these three goddesses are mentioned as the three out of the five daughters of *Brahmā*;<sup>46</sup> (ii) In PdP and SkP both *Gāyatrī* and *Sāvitrī* are mentioned as the two female friends of *Sarasvatī*;<sup>47</sup> (iii) In PdP again, while *Sarasvatī* is mentioned as the virgin daughter of *Brahmā* ('कुमारी वनया' V.18.165d),

44. of. BhP. III. 12. 53 ; DBhP. IX. 1. 127 ; SvP. II. 1. 132 ; BrP. 2. 1 ff. ; ViP. I. 7. 17 ff. ; VP. I. 10. 7. ff. ; LiP. I. 5. 15 f. ; etc. In the MP, the name of the wife of *Svāyam̐huva* Manu is '*Anantā*' (v. I. '*Ananti*'), who also is said, like Śatarūpa, to have given birth to two sons—*Priyavrata* and *Uttānapāda* (MP. 4. 38 f). So both Śatarūpa and *Anantā* (or *Ananti*) seem to refer to the same person.

45. Mbh. VI. 117. 8 ff. (See App. of this article).

46. 'सावित्री चैव गायत्री श्रद्धा मेधा सरस्वती ॥ एषा मम सुता ज्येष्ठा धर्मसंस्थानहेतवः ।' (BrP 102. 2u, 3p)

47. Cf. PdP V. 18. 185 f. and SkP VII. 33. 59 f. where गङ्गा, यमुना, गायत्री and सावित्री are mentioned as friends of *Sarasvatī*.

both Sāvitrī and Gāyatrī are mentioned as the two wives of Brahman.<sup>48</sup> Gāyatrī is 'the mother of the Vedas' (वेदमाता, PdP 17. 308d; 309a). Sāvitrī is also mentioned as 'the mother of the four Vedas' (‘माता चतुर्णां वेदानाम्’ BrP II. 1. 39c), and Sarasvatī is called, as has already been mentioned before, 'the presiding deity of knowledge' (‘ज्ञानाधिदेवता’ *ib.* 31b) and 'the symbol or form of all the branches of learning' (‘सर्वविद्यास्वरूपा’ *ib.* 31c). Thus, like the Vedic Sarasvatī, Bhārati and Ilā, these three goddesses—Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī Gāyatrī—belong to the sphere of knowledge (*vidyā, jñāna, Veda*).

(6) **Sarasvatī and Śrī**: These two goddesses—Sarasvatī and Lakṣmī—cover the entire sphere of man's life; Sarasvatī symbolises intellectual, moral and spiritual advancement or *mukti*, and Lakṣmī represents physical and worldly well-being or *bhukti*. The healthy evolution of a man's being depends on the harmony and close association of these two divine principles in his life. The greater is the harmony between Sarasvatī and Lakṣmī (i. e. between *mukti* and *bhukti*, or between *jñāna* and *bhoga*) in a man's life, the more he advances towards perfection. The Purāṇas have kept this truth in view. The BvP and DBhP. have represented Sarasvatī and Lakṣmī as the wives of Viṣṇu, living in harmony.<sup>49</sup> The BrP also says that Viṣṇu holds Sarasvatī in his mouth and Lakṣmī in his bosom, by virtue of which he is both *survaṇṇu* (omni-scient) and *Lakṣmīvān* (most prosperous and glorious),<sup>50</sup> the two qualities essential for his being *Puruṣottama* and *Pūrṇa*.

Sarasvatī and Lakṣmī are so closely related in the Purāṇas that they are sometimes even identified. In the MP (66. 9) and PdP (V. 22. 184c) 'Lakṣmī' has been mentioned as one of the

48. Cf. 'सावित्रीपतये देव गायत्रीपतये नमः' (PdP V. 15. 118u)—Brahmā praised by the gods.

49. Cf. 'लक्ष्मीः सरस्वती गङ्गा तिष्ठो भार्या हरेरपि ।

प्रेम्णा समास्तिष्ठन्ति सततं हरिसंनिधौ ॥' (BvP II. 6. 17).

50. Cf. 'विभ्रत् सरस्वतीं वक्त्रे सर्वज्ञोऽसि नमोस्तु ते ।

लक्ष्मीवानस्यतो लक्ष्मीं विभ्रद् वक्षसि चानघ ॥' (BvP 112. 71u, 72p)

eight *tanus* or forms of *Sarasvatī*. In the *Sarasvatī-stotra* of the PdP. (V. 27. 166 ff.) and also of the SkP (VI. 46. 22 ff.) '*Lakṣmī*' is one of the epithets or names of Goddess *Sarasvatī*. Similarly, in the '*Lakṣmī-stotra*' of the ViṣP (I. 9. 117 ff.) '*Sarasvatī*' has been mentioned as one of the epithets of Goddess *Lakṣmī*. Even some parallel ślokaś containing the same epithets for the two goddesses—*Sarasvatī* and *Lakṣmī*—are found in the above mentioned *Sarasvatī-stotra* of the PdP. and the *Lakṣmī-stotra* of the ViṣP.<sup>51</sup> Some connection is also found mentioned in the RV between *Lakṣmī* and *vāc*,<sup>52</sup> although the word '*Lakṣmī*', there, is the name of a quality (power, success, efficacy etc.) and not of a goddess, for *Lakṣmī* is not yet deified or personified in the RV; still it might supply some clue to the evolution of the Purāṇic conception of the relation of *Lakṣmī* and *Sarasvatī*.

(7) **Sarasvatī. Gandharvas and Devas :** *Sarasvatī*, the Indian Muse, has been represented as holding a *vāṇā*, and regarded as the goddess of music ('सर्वसंगीतसंभानतालकारणरूपिणी' BvP II. 1. 34p), and as such she has been associated with the Gandharvas who are also regarded as the musicians of gods (सुरगायकाः)<sup>53</sup>. As the goddess of speech (वाग्देवता) she has been associated with the Devas or gods who are also called *gīrvāṇas* (गीर्वाणाः). According to the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā (19. 12) *Sarasvatī* was the physician with *vāc* at the healing sacrifice of the gods. (See p. 58).

(8) **Sarasvatī and Soma :** As *Sarasvatī* may be said to represent *jñāna* and *Soma* may symbolize *karma* or *bhoga* produced by *karma*, the relation between *Sarasvatī* and *Soma* may be regarded as very close or even inseparable; the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Purāṇas* also lend to this view.

51. cf. PdP V. 27. 117 f. and ViṣP I. 9. 119 f. (App.)

52. cf. RV X. 71. 2 ('सक्तुमिव तितउना पुनन्तो'...भद्रैषां लक्ष्मीनिहिताधिवावि')

53. cf. 'विश्वसुप्रभृतयो गन्धर्वाः सुरगायकाः ।

तुम्बुरुनरिदश्चैव साक्षादेव सरस्वती ॥

जयमङ्गलपद्यानि पठन्तः पटुगीतिभिः ।

(BdP IV. 20. 101f.)

An interesting episode regarding *Sarasvatī* and *Soma*, indicating the inseparableness of their relation, is narrated in the BrP (Adh. 105).<sup>54</sup> *Soma*, who gives vigour and vitality to the Devas (देवानां प्राणदः), was possessed by the Gandharvas. But the Devas were anxious to have *Soma* for themselves, and so they consulted *Brahmā*. *Sarasvatī*, who was sitting beside *Brahmā*, advised the Devas to buy *Soma* from the Gandharvas in her exchange; she told them that as the Gandharvas always crave for women ('क्षीप्रिया नित्यं' 8 a; 'क्षीयु कामुकाः' 11 b) they would readily accept the exchange. But the Devas told *Sarasvatī* that they could not do without either of the two, and so wanted both *Soma* and *Sarasvatī* for themselves. There-upon *Sarasvatī* revealed to the Devas her intention to return to them afterwards by some trick. According to the suggestions of *Sarasvatī* the Devas organised a sacrifice (ऋतु, मख), invited the Gandharvas to the sacrifice, and offered to them *Sarasvatī* in exchange for *Soma*. The Gandharvas took *Sarasvatī* from the Devas, and gave *Soma* to them. Afterwards, *Sarasvatī* returned to the Devas according to her plans, and so both *Soma* and *Sarasvatī* now belonged to the Devas, and the Gandharvas were deprived of both *Soma* and *Sarasvatī* ('ततोऽभवद्देवानां सोमश्चापि सरस्वती । गन्धर्वाणां नैव सोमो नैवासीच्च सरस्वती १ 17f.)

A parallel episode about *Sarasvatī* and *Soma*, is briefly given in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa also.<sup>55</sup> According to the account of the ŚB the Devas gave *Vāk* (*Sarasvatī*) to the Gandharvas in exchange for their *Soma*, and afterwards she (*Vāk* or *Sarasvatī*) returned to the Devas along with *Soma*-देव्यो (गन्धर्वेभ्यो) वाचं प्राहिण्वन्, सैनान् (देवान्) सह सोमेनागच्छन् १ (ŚB III, ii. 4. 3). The ŚB here speaks of *Vāk* (*Sarasvatī*), as one 'exchanged for buying *Soma*' ('वाग्वै सोमक्रयणी' ib. III. ii. 4. 10).<sup>56</sup>

9. **Sarasvatī and Dharma** : According to the PdP (V. 37. 79ff.) *Sarasvatī* was produced by *Brahmā*, and was given to

54. BrP 105. 2-18.

55. Cf. ŚB III. ii. 4. 1-10.

56. This ŚB-account seems to be the original of which the BrP-account might be said to be an amplification. It is a good illustration of how the Purāṇas have amplified the Veda.

Dharma as his wife along with four other daughters or goddesses : 'लक्ष्मीः सरस्वती संख्या विशेषा च मता शुभा (२.१. विश्वेशा च महायशाः) ॥ देवी सरस्वती चैव ब्रह्मणा निर्मिता पुरा । एताः पञ्च वरिष्ठा वै सुरश्रेष्ठाश्च पार्थिव ॥ दत्ता धर्मय भद्रं ते ब्रह्मणा दृष्टकर्मणा'. But other Purāṇas and the Harivamśa (I. 3. 31) mention 'मरुत्वती' (and not 'सरस्वती') as the name of one of the wives of Dharma, and the PdP also later on mentions the name 'मरुत्वती' in place of 'सरस्वती' ('मरुत्वती मरुत्वतो देवानजनयत् सुतान्' ib. 98u). So 'मरुत्वती' here may be a variant for 'सरस्वती', or another name or epithet of Goddess Sarasvatī as in the R̥gveda (II. 30. 8).

### 5. The ghora or awful aspect of Sarasvatī

So far we have discussed the *saumya* form of Goddess Sarasvatī. In the Veda as well as in the Purāṇas she has also been conceived in her *ghora* or awful aspect. As has already been said the R̥gveda speaks of her as *ghorā* and *Vṛtraghnī* (VI. 61. 7). The Purāṇas have further amplified the conception of her *ghora* aspect. The Vāyu P. speaks of Sarasvatī as of 'loud roar' ('महानादा' I. 23. 34). In the Brahmāṇḍa P. (*Lalitopākhyāna*) Sarasvatī has been included among the nine Mother-goddesses or *Saktis*—'लक्ष्मीः सरस्वती गौरी चण्डिका त्रिपुराम्बिका । भैरवी भैरवी काली महाशाली च मातरः ॥' (BdP. IV. 7. 27). She has, thus, been associated here with such terrific goddesses as चण्डिका, भैरवी, काली etc. Further, when Goddess *Lalitā* marched in her great chariot to fight with the demon called Bhaṇḍāsura, Sarasvatī, along with some other *Saktis*, also accompanied her. Like the other *Saktis* of the group Sarasvatī is also represented here as 'a virgin with eyes red with anger,' and 'armed with lance and disc to kill the powerful demon.'<sup>87</sup> Resembling this *ghora* form of Sarasvatī eight other female goddesses or *Saktis* called the *Rahasya-Yoginīs* are also mentioned. Like Sarasvatī they are also the presiding deities of speech ('वागधीश्वराः'), 'adorned with lutes and books' ('वीणापुस्तकशोभिताः'), 'holding arrows and bows in their hands' ('बाणकार्मुकपाणयः'), and wearing armour

<sup>87</sup>. BdP. IV. 19. 70 ff. (App.)

on their bodies.<sup>58</sup> These *Rahasya-Yoginīs* are perhaps the extension of the *ghora* aspect of Sarasvatī.

In the *Vaiṣṭika Rahasya* appended to the *Devī-Māhātmya* Sarasvatī has been spoken as 'produced from the body of Gaurī or Duṛgā,' and 'constituted of the pure *sattva*,' she has eight hands, bearing an arrow, a mace, a trident, a disc, a conch, a bell, a plough and a bow in them; she is the killer of the two demons named Śumbha and Niśumbha; and she bestows omni-science when worshipped with devotion.<sup>59</sup> The same Goddess Sarasvatī has been conceived here in two forms. In the case of demons, who represent the dark and evil forces of the universe, she is *ghorā*, but at the same time she is also *saumyā* conferring omni-science on her worshippers. Thus a synthesis has been established here in the two apparently opposite aspects of Sarasvatī.

## 6. Anthropomorphic form or *vigraha* of Sarasvatī

The question whether gods are endowed with some *ākāra* or form engaged the attention of the ancient sages. Yāska in his *Nirukta* (VII. 2. 2f) starts an interesting discussion on the question of *ākāra* or *vigraha* of gods ( 'अथाकारचिन्तनं देवतानाम्' ). He records various views on this important question. He says that some regard gods as having anthropomorphic form ( 'पुरुषविधाः स्युरित्येकम्' ), some regard them as of non-anthropomorphic form ( 'अपुरुषविधाः स्युरित्येकम्' ), and some hold the view that gods have both kinds of form—anthropomorphic as well as non-anthropomorphic ( 'अपि बोधयविधाः स्युः' ).

The Purāṇas have anthropomorphized most of their gods. The description of the anthropomorphic form of Goddess Sarasvatī is found scattered in several Purāṇas. The BvP in its *Prakṛti-Khaṇḍa* gives vivid description of the form of Sarasvatī. The DBhP (IX) literally follows the BvP in this respect. Several other Purāṇas also give some description of the *Vigraha*

58. ib. 46 ff. (App.)

59. Cf. *Vaiṣṭika*. (App.)

of Sarasvatī. The *Sarasvatī-Bahasya-Upaniṣad* also has given a detailed description of the anthropomorphic form of Sarasvatī. All this description may be classified as follows :—

(a) She is of white colour ('शुक्लवर्णी' BvP II. 2. 54d ; 4. 46a), resembling snow, sandal, kunda flower, moon, kumuda and lotus in colour ('हिमचन्दनकुन्देन्दुकुमुदाम्भोजसन्निभा' *ib.* 1. 36a ; 5 13p), smiling and extremely charming ('सस्मिता सुमनोहरा' *ib.* 4. 46b) and having a lustrous and graceful form bright like the light of the millions of moons ('कोटिचन्द्रप्रभाजुष्टपृष्ठश्रीयुक्तविग्रहाम्' *ib.* 4. 46a). The SkP calls her 'शारदाम्बुदसंकाशा' (VII. 33. 33) resembling the white cloud of the autumn. The SRUp also regards her form as wholly white ('सर्वशुक्ला'), and resembling snow, pearl-necklace, camphor and the moon in lustre ('नीहारहारचनसारसुधाकराभा'); her neck resembles a conch in shape ('कम्बुकण्ठी') and her lips are copper-red ('सुताम्रोष्ठी'). The pure white colour of her *vighna* may be due to her form being made of the pure *sattva*. ('शुद्धसत्त्वस्वरूपा' BvP II. 1. 36a). The Rgveda has also conceived her form as 'of white colour', she is addressed there as 'शुभ्रे' (RV VII 95. 6 ; Sāyana : 'शुभ्रे शुभ्रवर्णे देवि'). The SRUp mentions her as being adorned on her forehead with the crescent moon, and the *Tantrasāra* also mentions her as 'चन्द्रार्धकिङ्कतमस्तकाम्'.

(b) In the SkP she has been conceived as 'having four arms' ('चतुर्भुजा' VI. 46. 17d). In the PrādhR. Sarasvatī (i.e. Mahāsarasvatī) has been conceived as having four hands; and in the VaikṛtR. Sarasvatī, the destroyer of the demons Śumbha and Niśumbha, is said to have eight arms ('अष्टभुजा'). The Vāyu P. (I. 23. 46ff.) has conceived Sarasvatī as representing the *Prakṛti*, and, as such, having four hands ('चतुर्हस्ता') four feet ('चतुष्पादा' or 'चतुष्पदा'), four faces ('चतुर्मुखी', 'चतुर्वक्त्रा') and four eyes ('चतुर्नेत्रा').

(c) According to the BvP she holds a lute and a book in her hands ('वीणापुस्तकधारिणी' BvP II. 1. 35d ; 2. 55b). According to the SkP she holds a beautiful lotus in her right hand, a rosary in the other hand, a *Kamaraḍala* filled with the celestial



water in the third, and her book, the source of all the learning, in the left hand (‘दधतीं दक्षिणे हस्ते कमलं सुमनोहरम् । अक्षमालां तथान्यस्मिन् जिततारकवर्चसम् ॥ कमण्डलुं तथान्यस्मिन् दिव्यवारिप्रपूरितम् । पुस्तकं च तथा वामे सर्वविद्यासमुद्भवम् ॥’ VI. 46. 17f). According to the MP she holds *vīṇā*, *akṣamālā*, *kumandalu* and *pustaka* in her hands (‘...वीणाक्षमणि [v.l. ०क्षमाल] धारिणीम् ।...सकमण्डलुपुस्तकाम् ॥’ 66. 9). The SRUp mentions her as holding *akṣasūtra* (rosary), *aṅkuśa* (goad), *pāśa* (noose) and *pustaka* (book)—(‘अक्षसूत्राङ्कुशधरा पाशपुस्तकधारिणी’). The PrādhR speaks of her as holding *akṣamālā*, *aṅkuśa*, *vīṇā* and *pustaka* (‘अक्षमालाङ्कुशधरा वीणापुस्तकधारिणी’ 15p). The BvP says that she repeats the name of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Parmātman, with her *ratnamālā* or jewel-rosary (‘जपन्ती परमात्मानं श्रीकृष्णं रत्नमालया’ BvP. II. 1. 37 p).

(d) She wears fire-like pure garments (‘वह्निशुद्धांशुकाधाना’ BvP. II. 4. 47a). BvP also speaks of her as wearing yellow garments (‘पीतवस्त्रपरीधाना’ *ib.* 2. 55a). According to the SkP she puts on white garments (‘सिताम्बरधरा’ VII. 33. 33). Her body is besmeared with white sandal (‘सितचन्दनगुण्डिता’ *ib.*). She is adorned with Jewel-ornaments (‘रत्नभूषणभूषाढ्या’ BvP II. 2. 55c; ‘रत्नसारङ्ग-खचितवरभूषणभूषिताम्’ *ib.* 4. 47b). She is also adorned with a *kanaka camruka* garland<sup>60</sup> (‘कनकचम्पकदामभूषाम्’ SRUp), and wears a pearl-necklace (‘मुक्ताहारसमायुक्ता’ *ib.*). According to the SkP also she is adorned with an excellent necklace of pure pearls (‘तारहारविभूषिता’ VII. 33. 33). Bāṇa in the *Haryacarita* says that Sarasvatī had her body purified by wearing a *Brahmasūtra* or sacred thread over her shoulder (‘अंसावलम्बिता ब्रह्मसूत्रेण पवित्रीकृतकाया’ Hcar. p 8).

(e) According to MP (66. 9) and PdP (V. 22. 184) Sarasvatī is said to have eight forms (*tanus*) named as लक्ष्मी, मेधा, धरा, पुष्टि, गौरी, तुष्टि, प्रभा and मति.<sup>61</sup> The SRUp also says that Sarasvatī has been conceived in eight forms according to her different *nāmas* and *jātibis* etc. (‘नामजात्यादिभिर्मेदैरष्टधा या विकल्पिता’).

60. ‘कनकचम्पक’ is a species of चम्पक flower. (cf. M. W.).

61. ‘लक्ष्मीमेधा धरा पुष्टिगौरी तुष्टिः प्रभा मतिः । एताभिः पाहिं चाष्टाभिस्तनूभिर्मां सरस्वती ॥’ (MP. 66-9; PdP. V. 22. 184). These eight *tanus* of Sarasvatī are, in fact, rather her eight names or attributes,

### 7. Iconographical Representations of Sarasvatī

In the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas we find some references to the iconographical representations or *aroṇas* of Goddess Sarasvatī. In the Mbh. King Yudhiṣṭhira is said to have visited the sacred *āyatana*s or temples of Sarasvatī and other sacred gods near the place called *śūrpāraka* on the sea-coast during his pilgrimage.<sup>62</sup> The SkP says that King Ambuvīci installed a *caturbhuja* earthen *pratimā* of Goddess Bhārātī at a place situated in the हाटकेश्वरक्षेत्र (modern 'बढनगर' in Gujarat, according to a footnote in the Veṅk. ed. of the SkP), and this place came to be known as the *Sārasvata-tīrtha* on account of the installation of the *pratimā* of Sarasvatī.<sup>63</sup> The VāmP says that God *Śhāṇu* (Śiva) himself installed Sarasvatī in the *liṅga* form ( 'स्थापयामास देवेशो लिङ्गाकारं सरस्वतीम्' 40. 4u) at *Śhāṇu-tīrtha*.

Sarasvatī is also said to have established herself in the form of *pratimā* at certain places. The SkP says that Sarasvatī, holding the *Vaḍavānala* or the sub-marine fire, established herself in the south-east of *Someśvara* at Prabhāsa, it enjoins the worship of this *vaḍavānala-dhārini* *pratimā* of Sarasvatī; on account of this *pratimā* the place was known as the *Agni-tīrtha*.<sup>64</sup> In another place also the SkP says that Sarasvatī established herself in the form of a *mūrti* ('मूर्तिमती सती') on the sea-coast, in the south-west of the *Bhairaveśvara liṅga* which she had already installed for worship before putting the submarine fire into the ocean.<sup>65</sup>

62. Cf. Mbh. III. 118. 9 ff.—'सरस्वत्याः सिद्धगणस्य चैव पुण्याश्च ये चाप्यमरास्तथान्ये । पुरयानि चाप्यायतनानि तेषां ददर्श राजा सुमनोहराणि ॥' (Śl. 19).

63. Cf. SKP VI. 46. 12 ff.—'ततस्तूर्णं समादाय मूर्तिकां स नदीतटात् । चकार भारतीं देवीं स्वयमेव चतुर्भुजाम् ॥' Śl. 17; also 'अथप्रभृति मद्राक्यास्तस्या स्थेयमसंशयम् । अत्रार्चाया त्रिलोकेऽस्मिन् यावत्कीर्तिर्मम स्थिरा ॥' (Said by Ambuvīci to Sarasvatī)

64. Cf. ib. VII. 34. 32 f.—'सोमेशाद् दक्षिणामेधे सागरस्य समीपतः । संस्थिता तु महादेवी वडवानलधारिणी ॥ स्नात्वाऽग्नितीर्थे पूर्वं तां पुजयेद्विधिना नरः ।'

65. Cf. ib. VII. 40. 5 ff.—'इत्युक्ता तु तदा देवी सैरवेश्वरनैर्ऋते । सागरस्य स्थिता रम्ये तत्र मूर्तिमती सती'

Some Purāṇas also contain chapters on Iconography, giving various instructions for making *pratimās* or *arcās* of several important deities. The Agni Purāṇa prescribes that the *pratimā* of Goddess Sarasvatī should have *pustaka*, *akṣamālā* and *vīṇā* in her hands.<sup>66</sup> The *pratimā* of Brahmā should also have *Sarasvatī* and *Śāvitṛī* on the left and right sides.<sup>67</sup> The Matsya Purāṇa also says that on the left side of Brahmā *Śāvitṛī* should be installed, and on the right side should be installed *Sarasvatī*.<sup>68</sup> For the purpose of worshipping Sarasvatī on certain occasions a water-jar and a book are also prescribed as her symbolical representations and as temporary substitutes for her *pratimā*.<sup>69</sup>

Almost all the principal Purāṇic gods and goddesses have their special *vāhānas*. But there is, perhaps, no direct mention of the *vāhāna* of Goddess Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas. Sarasvatī however, being conceived as ब्रह्माणी (daughter or wife of ब्रह्मा), should have the same *vāhāna* as Brahmā's. The MP in its chapters on the *pratimā-lakṣaṇa* says that *Brahmā* should be iconographically represented as seated on a *swan* or on a *lotus* ('हंसारूढः क्वचित्कार्यः क्वचिच्च कमलासनः' MP 260. 40u). Sarasvatī also being *Brahmāṇī*, should be iconographically represented like *Brahmā* ('ब्रह्माणी ब्रह्मसदृशी...हंसारूढा कर्तव्या' *ib.* 261. 24 f.), and therefore she should also be made seated on a *swan* (हंसारूढा) in her iconographical representations. The *Tantrasāra* also mentions her as 'हंसारूढा हरहंसितहारेन्दुकुन्दाववाता.' (Tsār, p. 204)

### 8. Sarasvatī-worship in the Purāṇas

Through their various accounts and ākhyānas of gods and goddess the Purāṇas aim at inspiring devotional emotions and spiritual thoughts in us. For them the mere intellectual and

66. अथ चरञ्छादिप्रतिमालक्षणानि—'पुस्तकाक्षमालिकाहस्ता वीणाहस्ता सरस्वती' (AP 50. 16 p).

67. 'आज्यस्थाली सरस्वती सावित्री वामदक्षिणे' (*ib.* 40. 15 u).

68. 'आज्यस्थाली न्यसेत्पाश्वे वेदांश्च चतुरः पुनः । वामपाश्वेऽस्य सावित्री दक्षिणे च सरस्वतीम् ॥' (MP 260. 41)

69. *Cf.* प्रतिविश्वेषु ते पुजां महतीं ते मुदान्विताः । माषस्य शुक्लपञ्चम्यां विद्यारम्भेषु सुन्दरि ॥...महारेण करिष्यन्ति कल्पे कल्पे यथाविधि ।...जितेन्द्रियाः संयताश्च पुस्तकेषु घटेऽपि च ॥ (BvP II, 4 23 ff.)

informative study of the spiritual and the religious problems without the emotional and spiritual background is of not much avail. Even in giving historical and genealogical details of the important royal dynasties the Purāṇas aim at results of higher values than mere supplying informative knowledge about them, as the Purāṇic *phalaśrutis* indicate. The review of the Purāṇic conception of Sarasvatī, therefore, will be incomplete without going through some important accounts of the devotional side of this conception.

(1) *Origin of Sarasvatī-worship according to the Purāṇas :*

According to the Purāṇas Sarasvatī-worship was first started by the three great gods of the trinity. The BvP says that at first Goddess Sarasvatī was worshipped by Brahmā, and after that she was worshipped in the three worlds by all the gods, sages and men.<sup>70</sup> Elsewhere it says that Sarasvatī-worship was first formulated by Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and he, though himself worshipped by all the creatures, worshipped the Goddess, and then Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Mahēśvara performed her worship and also Ananta, Dharma, sages like Sanake and others, all the gods, Manus and men worshipped her; and thus Sarasvatī became adorable by all the worlds.<sup>71</sup> The PdP says that Viṣṇu, the best of the gods, worshipped Sarasvatī at the *Prācīna tīrtha* which, therefore, became the best *tīrtha* on the earth.<sup>72</sup> According to the VāmP God *Sthānu* (Śiva) worshipped Sarasvatī and installed her in the form of *līṅga* at the *Sthānu-tīrtha*.<sup>73</sup> The

70. 'आदौ सरस्वती देवी ब्रह्मणा परिपूजिता । तत्पश्चात् त्रिषु लोकेषु देवता-मुनिमानवैः ॥' (BvP II. 1. 167; also DBhp IX. 1. 161 u-162p).

71. (BvP II. 4. 11f) — 'आदौ सरस्वतीपूजा श्रीकृष्णेन विनिर्मिता ।' (11 p.)  
 ... 'इत्युक्त्वा पूजयामास तां देवीं सर्वपूजितः ॥ (28 u) ततस्तत्पूजनं चक्रुर्ह्यविष्णु-महेश्वराः । अनन्तश्चापि धर्मश्च मुनीन्द्राः सनकादयः ॥ सर्वे देवाश्च मानवो नृपा वा मानवादयः । बभूव पूजिता नित्या सर्वलोकैः सरस्वती ॥ (29f.)

72. 'देवानां प्रवरो विष्णुस्तेन यत्र सरस्वती ॥ सेविता तत्परं तीर्थं क्षितौ ब्रह्म-मुतोऽब्रवीत् ॥' (PdP V. 27. 146f.)

73. 'यत्रेष्ट्वा भगवान् स्थाणुः पूजयित्वा सरस्वतीम् । स्थापयामास देवेशो लिङ्गाकारां सरस्वतीम् ॥' (VāmP 40. 4).

Purāṇas thus by conceiving the three great gods as the first worshippers of Goddess Sarasvatī, have attached great importance to her worship. In the days of the great Epic Mahābhārata also Sarasvatī-worship was in vogue : In reply to Śrī Kṛṣṇa's query about the gods who are being worshipped by him, Nārada enumerates the names of a number of deities whom he (Nārada) worships, and Sarasvatī is mentioned as one of those deities.<sup>74</sup>

(2) *Special occasions for Sarasvatī-worship :*

The BvP and the DBhP have prescribed the *śukla-pāṇamī* day of the month of *Māgha* ('माघस्य शुक्लपञ्चम्याम्' BvP II. 4. 23c, 34a) and the day on which a child's education is formally to begin ('विद्यारम्भदिनेऽपि च' *ib.* 23d, 34b) as the special occasions on which Sarasvatī should be worshipped. Besides, the Purāṇas prescribe various *tithis* or the days of the lunar months for Sarasvatī-worship. According to the SkP Sarasvatī as installed in her *arcā*-form at the *Sarasvata-tīrtha* should be worshipped on the *uśnī* and *caturdaśī*;<sup>75</sup> and at Prabhāsa where she installed herself near the *Bhairaveśvara liṅga* she should be worshipped along with *Bhairaveśvara* on the *maḥā-navamī* (i.e. the ninth day of the bright half of the month of *Āśvina*).<sup>76</sup> The AP prescribes the *trītyā-tithi* of the month of *Jyestha* (?) for the worship of Sarasvatī.<sup>77</sup> The PdP and the MP have prescribed *pāñcamīs* of each *pakṣa* of a month for her worship as a part of the *Sarasvata-vrata*.<sup>78</sup>

(3) *Formulas and rules of Sarasvatī-worship :*

Certain special rules and formulas have been prescribed by the BvP (II. 4) and DBhP (II. 4) for Sarasvatī-worship.

74. Cf. Mbh. XIII. 81. 5 ff. (App.)

75. Cf. 'यो मामत्र स्थितो नित्यं स्नात्वाऽत्र सलिले शुभे । ऋष्ट्या च चतुर्दश्यां पूजयिष्यति मानवः ॥' etc. (SkP VI. 46. 37 ; also cf. *śl.* 89)

76. Cf. SKP VII. 41. 8.—'पूजयेत्तां विधानेन तं तथा भैरवेवरम् । महानवम्यां यत्नेन कृत्वा स्नानं विधानतः ॥'

77. Cf. AP 178. 27 f (App.)

78. Cf. PdP V. 22. 186 ; MP 66. 11p.—'पञ्चम्यां प्रतिपक्षं च पूजयेद् ब्रह्मवासिनीम् ।'...

Various requisites as white flowers white *akṣataś*, white sandal-wood, milk etc. are also prescribed in details for her worship (BvP II. 4. 35 ff.). According to the BvP (II. 4. 31 ff.) Sainṣvalī worship mainly consists of the *stavana* (eulogy), *dhyāna* (meditation of her form), *karaca* and *mantra-japa*. A number of highly inspiring *Sarasvatī stotras* are given in the Purāṇas which deserve a special study. The *dhyāna* which the BvP (II. 4. 46-48) prescribes is as follows :

‘सरस्वतीं शुक्लवर्णां सस्मितां सुमनोहराम् ।  
कोटिचन्द्रप्रभाजुष्टपुष्पश्रीयुक्तविग्रहाम् ॥  
वह्निशुद्धां शुकाधानां सस्मितां सुमनोहराम् ।  
रत्नसारिन्द्रखचितवरभूषणभूषिताम् ॥  
सुपूजितां सुरगणैर्ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवादिभिः ।  
वन्दे भक्त्या वन्दितां तां मुनीन्द्रमनुमानवैः ॥’

The *Sarasvatī-karaca* mentioned in the BvP (II. 4. 61 ff.) is named as the *Viśvajaya*. It is to be worn in the neck or on the right arm in the form of a gold *guṭikā* (ib. 4. 27). The *karaca-siddhi* is said to be accomplished by five lacs of its *japa*.

The eight-syllabled *Sarasvatī-mantra* (‘श्रीं ह्रीं सरस्वत्यै स्वाहा’) as given in this Purāṇa is highly praised<sup>79</sup>, and a long tradition of the sages through whom it has been transmitted is also recorded (ib. 4. 53 ff.). The *mantra-siddhi* is said to be accomplished by its four lacs of *japa*.

The BvP also prescribes that the worship of Sarasvatī is to be performed after bath and performance of daily rites (‘स्नात्वा नित्यक्रियां कृत्वा’ 4. 35a). The worshipper is to remain physically and mentally pure (‘शुचिः’ ib. 34d), he should have complete control over his senses (‘जितेन्द्रिय’ ib. 26c), and should be constantly regular, self-controlled and disciplined (‘संयतः’ ib.) in life. According to the rules relating to the *Sārasvata-vrata* as

79. ‘सरस्वतीचतुर्थ्यन्तो वह्निजायान्त एव च ॥ श्रीं ह्रीं सरस्वत्यै स्वाहा । लक्ष्मी-मायादिकं चैव मन्त्रोऽयं कल्पपादपः ॥’ (BvP II. 4. 51 f.). (वह्निजाया = स्वाहा; लक्ष्मी = श्री; माया = ह्रीं).

given in the MP and PdP,<sup>80</sup> the worshipper is to observe throughout his *vrata* complete silence both at day-break and at sun-set ( 'सन्ध्यायां च तथा मौनमेत्कुर्वन् समाचरेत्' MP 66. 12p), and also at his morning and evening meals ( 'मौनव्रतेन भुञ्जीत सार्यं प्रातस्तु धर्मवित्' ib. 10u), he should also not eat any thing during the interval ( 'नान्तरा भोजनं कुर्यात्' ib. 12c). It is thus clear from these rules that a worshipper of Goddess Sarasvatī must have full control over both the functions—viz. speaking and tasting—of the tongue which is rightly regarded in the Purāṇas as the visible form of Goddess Sarasvatī in man;<sup>81</sup> and therefore the proper and controlled use of these two faculties of the tongue in a devotional spirit may also be regarded as a superior form of Sarasvatī-worship.

#### 4. Fruits accruing from Sarasvatī-worship

Sarasvatī has been primarily conceived as the goddess of speech, knowledge and wisdom; her devotion and worship, therefore, is naturally considered to bestow eloquence, intelligence, knowledge, wisdom, poetic genius and skill in arts.<sup>82</sup> Defects in speech and even dumbness are said to be cured by worshipping Sarasvatī.<sup>83</sup> The *Sarasvata-vrata*, given in the MP and PdP, is mentioned as conferring sweet and charming speech

---

80. In the MP and the PdP the *Sarasvata vrata* is given in two places : (i) MP-Adh. 66 (whole Adh. is devoted to this *vrata*, in the form of the interlocation between Manu and Matsya); PdP V. 22. 176-194, (interlocutors—Bhīṣma and Pulastya), (ii) as included in the *ṣaṣṭi vratas* (sixty *vratas* or vows), in MP 101. 17f, (interlocation between Nārada and Nandikeśvara); in PdP, V. 20. 61 f. (interlocutors—Bhīṣma and Pulastya). The versions of the two Purāṇas are exactly the same with a very few variants.

81. Cf. SkP. VI. 46. 20 b.

82. Cf. 'यस्तां पूजयते मर्त्यः श्वेतपुष्पानुलेपनैः । स स्याद् वाग्मी सुमेधावी सदा जन्मन्ति जन्मन्ति ॥' (SkP VI. 46.40); and 'महावाग्मी कवीन्द्रश्च त्रैलोक्यविजयी भवेत् ॥' (BvP II. 4. 90 p); etc.

83. Cf. 'सरस्वतीं पूजयित्वा वाग्दोषान्मुच्यतेऽस्त्रिलात्' (SkP VII. 40. 8u). King Ambuvici is said to have been cured of his dumbness by worshipping Sarasvatī (Vide the introductory footnote on the Sarasvatī-stotra given at the beginning of this Issue of 'Purāṇa').

( मधुरा भारती ), musical voice ( 'रक्तकण्ठ' ), grace and beauty ( 'रूप' )<sup>84</sup> wisdom and learning ( 'विद्या' ), wealth and prosperity ( 'वर्ध' ), and long life ( 'आयुश्च विपुल' ). The R̥gvedic R̥sis invoke Sarasvatī for conferring fame ( प्रशस्ति )<sup>85</sup> and prosperity ( श्री )<sup>86</sup>. The Sarasvatī-Rahasya Up. mentions भुक्ति (worldly enjoyments) and मुक्ति (final release or salvation) as accruing from the worship of Goddess Sarasvatī.<sup>87</sup>

### 9. Pantheistic and transcendent aspects of Sarasvatī

The Vedic literature has conceived Sarasvatī as occupying the *antarikṣa* or the middle region. In one place the R̥gveda even mentions Sarasvatī as filling the wide earthly and the middle regions with her *rajis* or light.<sup>88</sup> This Vedic conception of Sarasvatī (which may be called her regional conception) has developed into the Purāṇic conception of the pantheistic and then of the transcendent aspect of Sarasvatī.

The VāmP identifies Sarasvatī with all the waters of the world ( 'सर्वस्वापस्त्वमेवेति' VāmP, 40. 14 c. ) The SkP (VI. 46) identifies her with the speech in the tongue and the light in the eyes ( 'वाचारूपेण जिह्वायां ज्योतीरूपेण चतुर्षि' ), and also with the various psychological faculties and even with the various deities (such as गौरी, रोहिणी, सिनीवाली, अदिति, लक्ष्मी, विनता, कद्रू etc.). The PdP (V. 28. 118) identifies her with various lores or *vidyās*.

84. cf. 'एतत् सारस्वतं नाम रूपविद्याप्रदायकम्' ( • द्याप्रदं व्रतम्, PdP ) — (Mp 101. 18 u ; PdP V. 20. 62 u). The PdP also says that by giving silver in charity on the banks of the Sarasvatī river (the daughter of Brahmā) a man acquires beauty : ( 'रजतस्य प्रदानेन रूपवाञ्छायते नरः । पुण्या पुण्यजलोपेता नदीयं ब्रह्मणः सुता ॥' PdP V. 18. 463 ).

85. cf. R̥V II. 41. 16—'अम्बिमे नदीतमे देवितमे सरस्वति ।

अप्रशस्ता हव स्मसि प्रशस्तिमम्ब नस्कृधि ॥'

86. *Vide* R̥V. I. 188. 8 (*Āpri* -) quoted in the Appendix.

87. 'यः कवित्वं निरातङ्गं भुक्तिमुक्ती च वाञ्छति ।

सोऽम्यच्यैनां दशश्लोकया नित्यं स्तौति सरस्वतीम् ॥' (SRUp.)

88. cf. R̥V VI. 61. 11—'आपमृषी पार्थिवान्मृग रजो अन्तरिक्षम् ।.....॥'



The identification has been extended further and the whole universe—both animate and inanimate—has been conceived as the form of Sarasvatī.<sup>89</sup> In the *Sarasvatī-stotras* of the MārP (23. 30-47) and the VāmP (32. 6-22) the universe considered as consisting of the various triads,<sup>90</sup> has been conceived as represented by the three *mātrās* of the sacred syllable *Omkāra*; and the whole universe thus conceived as the three *mātrās* of *Omkāra*, and consisting of both which is imperishable and perishable, existent and non-existent, is said to be the form of Sarasvatī.<sup>91</sup> Thus the pantheistic conception of Sarasvatī has been fully developed in the Purāṇas.

But the Purāṇas do not stop here. They extend their conception of Sarasvatī, far beyond the manifested universe, to the unmanifest ultimate Reality called the *Akṣara* (or *Para*) *Brahman*. The remaining silent *ardha-mātrā* of the *Omkāra* represents this unmanifest *Akṣara-Brahman*, the eternal cosmic consciousness, which is incomprehensible and indescribable (अनिर्देश्य), changeless (अविकारि), imperishable, (अमय), divine (दिव्य), and devoid of all modifications (परिणामविवर्जित). This indescribable, unmanifest and eternal Reality is mentioned as the transcendent form of Sarasvatī.<sup>92</sup> In her transcendent form she cannot be described as One or Many, Existent or Non-existent, for her transcendent aspect is beyond all conceptions of duality.

89. cf. 'यत्किञ्चित् त्रिषु लोकेषु बहुत्वाद् यत्न कीर्तितम् ।

इङ्गितं नेङ्गितं तच्च तद्रूपं ते सुरेश्वरि ॥' (SkP VI. 46. 29 a.)

90. cf. MārP 23. 35 u-37 p; VāmP 32. 10-11. (App.)

91. cf. 'ओंकाराक्षरसंस्थानं यत्तु (यत्र, VāmP) देवि स्थिरास्थिरम् ॥

तत्र मात्रात्रयं सर्वमस्ति यद् देवि नास्ति च ।

... ..

एतन्मात्रात्रयं देवि तव रूपं सरस्वति ॥'

(MārP 23. 34 u-35 p; 37 u; VāmP 32. 9, 12 p.)

92. cf. अनिर्देश्यं तथा चान्यदहंमात्रात्स्वितं (० आश्रितं, VāmP) परम् ॥

अविकार्यक्षयं दिव्यं परिणामविवर्जितम् ।

तवैतत् परमं रूपं यत्न शक्यं मयोदितुम् ॥

(MārP 39 u-40 u; VāmP 23. 14-15 p.)

In fact, the Purāṇas have conceived all their principal deities in their double aspect—immanent and transcendent. In their transcendent form all the principal Purāṇic gods and goddesses have been identified with the *Akṣara Para-Brahman* (the eternal, absolute and ultimate Reality) where all conceptions of duality and non-duality meet and coincide, and where all these gods submerge and lose their individuality. In her indescribable transcendent aspect, therefore, Goddess Sarasvatī is not different from all the other principal deities—Durgā, Lakṣmī, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Gaṇeśa Sūrya, Vahni and others ; in this transcendent form *Sarasvatī* is herself *Viṣṇu*. She is *Śiva*, *Brahmā*, *Candra*, *Sūrya* and *Jyotiḥ* (Light, *Agni*) :

तवैतत् (v. 1.) परमं रूपं यन्न शक्यं मयोदितुम् ।

न चान्येन तथा जिह्वातालवोष्ठादिभिरुच्यते ॥

स विष्णुः स शिवो ब्रह्मा चन्द्रार्कज्योतिरेव च ।

(VamP 32, 15f.)

## APPENDIX I

Some important texts referred to in the footnotes but not quoted there are given below :

*fn. 3.* Relevant verses (*vs.*) of the Rgvedic *Apri-Sūktas* :

RV I. 13, 9—इळा सरस्वती मही तिस्रो देवीर्मयोभुवः । बहिः सीदन्त्वस्त्रिधः ॥

I. 188. 8—भारतीळे सरस्वति या वः सर्वा उपब्रुवे । ता नश्चोदयता श्रिये ॥

III. 4. 8—आ भारती भारतीभिः सजोषा इळा देवैर्मनुष्येभिरग्निः । सरस्वती सारस्वतेभिरवाक् तिस्रो देवीर्बाहिरेवं सदन्तु ॥

VII. 2. 8—Same as III. 4. 8.

X: 110. 8—आ नो यज्ञं भारती तूयमेत्विळा मनुष्वदिह चेतयन्ती । तिस्रो देवीर्बाहिरेवं स्योनं सरस्वती स्वपसः सदन्तु ॥

16. RV I. 3. 11—चोदयित्री सृनुतानां चेतन्ती मुमतीनाम् । यज्ञं दवे सरस्वती ॥

II. 41. 16—अम्बितमे नदीतमे देवितमे सरस्वति । अग्रशस्ता इव स्मसि प्रशस्तिमम्ब नस्कृधि ॥

(For I. 13, 9 and I. 188, 8—see above).

17. RV I. 89. 3—तान् पूर्वया निविदा हूमहे वयं भगं मित्रमविति दक्षमस्त्रिधम् ।  
अयमर्णं वरुणं सोममश्विना सरस्वती न. सुमगा मयस्करत् ॥

VI. 52. 6—इन्द्रो नेदिष्ठमवसागमिष्ठः सरस्वती सिन्धुभिः पिब्यमाना । पर्जन्यो  
न ओषधीभिर्मयोधुरग्निः सुशंसः सुहवः पितैव ॥

20. PdP V. 27. 118 f—यज्ञविद्या महाविद्या गुह्यविद्या च शोभना । आन्वीक्षिकी  
त्रयीविद्या दण्डनीतिश्च कथ्यते ॥ ११८ ॥ नमोऽस्तु ते पुण्यजले नमः  
सागरगमिनि । नमस्ते पापनिर्मोके नमो देवि वराङ्गने ॥ ११९ ॥

28. BvP II. 1. 1; 4. 4—गणेशजननी दुर्गा राधा लक्ष्मीः सरस्वती । सावित्री वै  
सृष्टिविधौ प्रकृतिः पञ्चधा स्मृता ॥

29. BvP II. 2. 54 f—एतस्मिन्नन्तरे देवीजिह्वाग्रात्सहसा ततः । आविर्बभूव  
कन्यैका शुक्लवर्णा मनोहरा ॥५४॥ पीतवक्त्रपरीधाना वीणापुस्तक-  
धारिणी । रत्नभूषणभूषाढ्या सर्वशालाधिदेवता ॥५५॥

30. VP I 9 67 ff—तेष्वेवं निरपेक्षेषु लोकवृत्तानुकारणात् ॥६७७॥ हिरण्य-  
गर्भो भगवान् परमेष्ठो ह्यचिन्तयत् । तस्य रोषात्समुत्पन्नः पुरुषोऽर्कसम-  
द्युतिः ॥ अर्द्धनारीनरवपुस्तेजसा ज्वलनोपमः ॥६८॥ सर्वं तेजोमयं  
जातमादित्यसमतोजसम् । विमजात्मनमित्युक्त्वा तत्रैवान्तरधीयत् ॥६९॥  
एवमुक्त्वा (?) द्विधामृतः पृथक् स्त्री पुरुषः पृथक् । स चैकादशधा जज्ञे  
अर्धमात्मानमीश्वरः ॥७०॥.....तत्र या सा महाभागा शङ्करस्यार्द्ध-  
कायिनी ॥७५॥ ७॥ प्राप्ता तु मया तुभ्यं स्त्री स्वयंभोर्मुञ्चोदगता । कायार्द्धं  
वक्षिणं तस्याः शुक्लं वामं तथाऽसितम् ॥७६॥ आत्मानं विमजस्वेति  
सोक्ता देवी स्वयंभुवा । सा तु प्रोक्ता द्विधा मृता शुक्ला कृष्णा च वै  
द्विजाः ॥ तस्या नामानि वक्ष्यामि शण्डुध्वं सुसमाहिताः ॥७७॥  
स्वाहा स्वधा महाविद्या मेधा लक्ष्मीः सरस्वती ॥७८॥.....लोकै  
गौरीति विश्रुता ॥७८॥..... विश्वरूपमधार्थायाः पृथग्देहविभावनात् ॥८०॥

31. VP I. 23. 34 ff—ब्रह्मणः पुत्रकामस्य ध्यायतः परमेष्ठिनः । प्रादुर्भूता  
महानादा विश्वरूपा सरस्वती ॥३४॥.....प्रकृतिं विद्धि तां ब्रह्मंस्त्वत्प्रसूतिं  
महेश्वरीम् ॥४९॥ ३॥ सैषा भगवती देवी तत्प्रसूतिः स्वयंभुवः । चतुर्भुजो  
जगद्योनिः प्रकृतिर्गौः प्रकीर्तिता । प्रधानं प्रकृतिं चैव यदाह्वस्तत्त्वचिन्तकाः ॥५०॥

32. BdP IV. 40. 5 ff—इयमेव महालक्ष्मीः सप्तर्षिष्वनयं पुरा ॥५॥ ३॥ परत्रयाणा-  
मानासं शक्तीनां तिष्ठणामपि । एकस्मादण्डतो जातावम्बिकापुरुषोत्तमौ ॥६॥  
श्रीविरिञ्चौ ततोऽन्यस्मादन्यस्माच्च गिराशिवौ । इन्दिरा योजयामास मुकुन्देन  
महेश्वरी ॥ पार्वत्या परमेशानं सरस्वत्या पितामहम् ॥७॥

33. PrādhR—सर्वस्याद्या महालक्ष्मीस्त्रिगुणा परमेश्वरी ॥४॥ पू०... शून्यं तदखिलं लोकं विलोक्य परमेश्वरी । बभार परमं रूपं तमसा केवलेन हि ॥७॥ .....महालक्ष्मीः स्वरूपमपरं नृप । सत्वाख्येनातिशुद्धेन गुणेनेन्दुप्रभं दधौ ॥१४॥ अथोवाच महालक्ष्मीर्महाकालीं सरस्वतीम् । युवां जनयतां देव्यौ मिथुने स्वानुरूपतः ॥१७॥ इद्युक्त्वा ते महालक्ष्मीः ससर्जं मिथुनं स्वयम् । हिरण्यगर्भौ हचिरौ स्त्रीपुंसौ कमलासनौ ॥१८॥ ब्रह्मान् विधे विरिञ्चेति धातरित्याह तं नरम् । श्रीः पद्मे कमले लक्ष्मीत्याह माता च तां जियम् ॥१९॥ महाकाली भारती च मिथुने खजतः सह । २० पू । नीलकण्ठं रक्तबाहुं श्वेताङ्गं चन्द्रशेखरम् । जनयामास पुरुषं महाकाली सितां जियम् ॥२१॥ स चन्द्रः शंकरः स्थाणुः कपर्दी च त्रिलोचनः । त्रयी विद्या कामधेनुः सा स्त्री भापाञ्जरा स्वरा ॥२२॥ सरस्वती जियं गौरीं कृष्णं च पुरुषं नृप । जनयामास नामानि तयोरपि वदामि ते ॥२३॥ विष्णुः कृष्णो हृषीकेशो वासुदेवो जनार्दनः । उमा गौरी सती चण्डी सुन्दरी सुभगा शिवा ॥२४॥ .....ब्रह्मणे प्रददौ पत्नीं महालक्ष्मीं नृप त्रयीम् । रुद्राय गौरीं वरदां वासुदेवाय च श्रियम् ॥२६॥

34. MP 3. 30 ff.—(एतत् तत्त्वात्मकं कृत्वा जगद् वेधा अजीजनत् ॥२९॥ उ॥) सावित्रीं लोकसृष्ट्यर्थं हृदि कृत्वा समास्थितः । ततः संजपतस्तस्य भित्त्वा देहमकम्भम् ॥३०॥ स्त्रीरूपमर्द्धमकरोदर्द्धं पुरुषरूपवत् । शतरूपा च सा ख्याता सावित्री च निगद्यते ॥३१॥ सरस्वत्यथ गायत्री ब्रह्मणी च परंतप ॥ ततः स्वदेहसंसृतामात्मजामित्यकल्पयत् ॥३२॥

37. MP 3. 33ff.—दृष्ट्वा तां व्यथितस्तावत् कामबाणादितो विभुः । अहो रूपमहो रूपमिति चाह प्रजापतिः ॥ ३३ ॥ ' अहो रूपमहो रूपमिति प्राह पुनः पुनः । ततः प्रणामनम्रां तां पुनरेवाभ्यलोकयत् ॥ ३५ ॥ .....सृष्ट्यर्थं यत्कृतं तेन तपः परमदारुणम् ॥ ३६ उ ॥ तत्सर्वं नाशमगमत् स्वसुतोपगमेच्छया । ४० पू । ' उपयेमे स विश्वात्मा शतरूपामनिन्दिताम् । संबभूव तथा सार्द्धमतिकामातुरो विभुः ॥ सलब्धं चकमे देवः कमलोदरमन्दिरे ॥ ४३ ॥ यावदब्दशतं दिवं यथाज्यः प्राकृतो जनः । ततः कालेन महता तस्य पुत्रोऽभवन्मनुः ॥ ४४ ॥ स्वार्थभुव इति ख्यातः स विराडिति नः श्रुतम् । ४५ पू ।

45. .Mbh. VI. 117. 8 ff.—रेमे स ( = दिवोदासः ) तस्यां ( = स्वपत्न्यां माधव्यां ) राजर्षिः प्रभावत्यां यथा रविः । स्वाहायां च यथा वह्निर्यथा शक्यां च वासवः ॥ ८ ॥ .....यथा भूम्यां भूमिपतिरुर्वश्यां च पुरुरवाः । ऋचीः सत्यवत्यां च सरस्वत्यां यथा मनुः ॥ १४ ॥

51. PJP V. 27. 117 f.—देवैः कृता सरस्वतीस्तुतिः 'त्वं सिद्धिस्त्वं स्वधा स्वाहा त्वं पवित्रं मतं ( v. 1. घृतं ) महत् । संध्या रात्रिः प्रभा भूतिर्मेधा अद्वा सरस्वती' ॥ ११७ ॥ 'यज्ञविद्या महाविद्या गुह्यविद्या च शोभना । आन्वीक्षिकी त्रयीविद्या दण्डनीतिश्च कथ्यते' ॥ ११८ ॥

ViṣP I. 119 ff.—इन्द्रकृता लक्ष्मीस्तुतिः 'त्वं सिद्धिस्त्वं स्वधा स्वाहा सुधा त्वं लोकपावनी । संध्या रात्रिः प्रभा भूतिर्मेधा अद्वा सरस्वती' ॥ ११९ ॥ 'यज्ञविद्या महाविद्या गुह्यविद्या च शोभने । आत्मविद्या च देवि त्वं विमुक्ति-फलदायिनी' ॥ १२० ॥ 'आन्वीक्षिकी त्रयी वार्त्ता दण्डनीतिस्त्वमेव च ॥ १२१ ॥'

57. BṛP IV. 19. 70 ff.—गेयचक्ररथेन्द्रस्य चतुर्थं पर्वं संश्रिताः । ब्राह्मीमुखास्तु पूर्वोक्ता-श्चण्डिका त्वष्टमी परा ॥ तत्र पर्वण्यघस्ताच्च लक्ष्मीश्चैव सरस्वती ॥ ७० ॥ रतिः प्रीतिः कीर्त्तिः शास्त्री पुष्टिस्तुष्टिश्च शक्तयः । एताश्च क्रोधरक्ताश्वयो दैत्यं हन्तुं महाबलम् ॥ ७१ ॥ कुन्तचक्रधराः प्रोक्ताः कुमार्यः कुम्भसंभव ॥ ७२ ॥

58. ib. 46 f.—अथ चक्ररथेन्द्रस्य तृतीयं पर्वं संश्रिताः । रहस्ययोगिनीनाम्ना प्रख्याता वागधीश्वराः ॥ ४६ ॥ रक्ताशोकप्रसूताभा बाणकार्मुकपाणयः । कवच-च्छन्नसर्वाङ्ग्यो वीणापुस्तकशोभिताः ॥ ४७ ॥

59. VaikṛtR 14 ff.—गौरीदेहात् समुद्भूता या सत्त्वैकगुणाश्रया । साक्षात्सरस्वती प्रोक्ता शुम्भासुरनिर्बाहिणी ॥ १४ ॥ दधौ चाष्टभुजा बाणमुसले शूलचक्रमुत् । शङ्खं घण्टां लाङ्गलं च कार्मुकं वसुधाधिप ॥ १५ ॥ एषा सम्पूजिता भक्त्या सर्वज्ञत्वं प्रयच्छति । निशुम्भमधिनी देवी शुम्भासुरनिर्बाहिणी ॥ १६ ॥

74. Mbh. XIII. 31. 5 ff.—Nārada says to Keśava: 'शृणु गोविन्द यानेतान् पूजयाम्यरिमर्दन' । ॥ ५ ॥ 'वरुणं वायुमादित्यं पर्जन्यं जातवेदसम् । स्याणुं स्कन्दं तथा लक्ष्मीं विष्णुं ब्रह्माणमेव च' ॥ ६ ॥ 'वाचस्पतिं चन्द्रमसमपः पृथ्वीं सरस्वतीम् । सततं ये नमस्यन्ति तान् नमस्याम्यहं विभो' । ७ ॥

77. AP 178. 27 f.—आत्मतृतीया मार्गस्य प्रार्थ्येच्छाभोजनादिना ॥ २७ उ ॥ गौरी काली उमा भद्रा दुर्गा कान्तिः सरस्वती । वैष्णवी लक्ष्मीः प्रकृतिः शिवा नारायणी क्रमात् ॥ मार्गतृतीयामारभ्य सौभाग्यं स्वर्गमाप्नुयात् ॥ २८ ॥

90. VāmP 32. 10 f.—त्रयो लोकास्त्रयो वेदास्त्रैविद्यं पावकत्रयम् । त्रीणि ज्योतीषि वर्गश्च त्रयो धर्मादयस्तथा ॥ १० ॥ त्रयो गुणास्त्रयो वर्णास्, ( ०यो शुब्बास्, MārP ) त्रयो देवास्तथाक्रमात् ( ०स्त्रयः क्रमाः, V. 1. ) । त्रिधातवस् ( त्रयः कालास्, MārP ) तथाऽवस्थाः पितरश्चाणिमादयः ( ०रोऽह्निनादयः V. 1., MārP ) ॥ ११ ॥ एतन्मात्रात्रयं देवि तव रूपं सरस्वति ॥ १२ ॥

## APPENDIX II

Explanation of the abbreviations for works used :

- ABORI = Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- AitB = Aitareya Brāhmaṇa ; Ānandāśrama edition, 1930-31. (*Ref.* : Adhyāya, Khaṇḍa).
- AP = Agni-Purāṇa ; Ānandāśrama ed. (*Ref.* : Adhyāya, Śloka).
- BdP = Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa ; Venkatesvara ed. (*Ref.* : Pāda [III = Upodghāta-Pāda ; IV = Upasamhāra-Pāda]. Adh. Śl.)
- BhP = Bhāgavata Purāṇa ; Gītā Press ed. (*Ref.* : Skandha, Adh. Śl.)
- BrP = Brahmi-Purāṇa ; Ān. ed., 1895. (*Ref.* : Adh. Śl.)
- BvP = Brahma-vaivarta-Purāṇa ; Ān. ed., 1935. (*Ref.* : Khaṇḍa [II = Prakṛti-Kh.]. Adh. Śl.)
- CDHM = A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology (By John Dowson); Ninth ed., London, 1957.
- ChUp. = Chāndogya Upaniṣad. (*Ref.* : Adhyāya, Khaṇḍa, Mantra).
- Durg. = Durgācārya's Vṛtti on the 'Nirukta' of Yāska ;
- DBhP = Devī-Bhāgavata-Purāṇa ; Banaras ed. (*Ref.* : Skandha, Adh. Śl.)
- DY = Devarāja-Yajvan's *Tikā* on the *Nighaṇṭu*, as included in Sāmaśrami's ed. of *Nirukta*, vol. I.
- Hem. = Hemacandra's Kośa named '*Anukārika Samgraha*'; Chawkhamba ed., V. S. 1985.
- Hcar. = Harṣa-carita of Bāṇa ; Nirṇaya S. ed., 1946.
- Hv. = Harivamśa ; Chitrashala Press ed., 1936. (*Ref.* : Parva [I = Harivamśa P.] Adh. Śl.)
- LIP = Liṅga Purāṇa ; Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara ed., Calcutta 1885 (*Ref.* : Pūrvārdha [I]. Adh. Śl.).
- Mbh. = Mahābhārata ; Chitrashala Press ed. (*Ref.* : Parva [III = Vana P. ; VI = Bhīṣma P. ; XIII = Anuśāsana P.]. Adh. Śl.)
- MP = Matsya-Purāṇa ; Ān. ed. (*Ref.* : Adh. Śl.)
- MārP = Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa ; J. V. ed., Calcutta 1879. (*Ref.* : Adh. Śl.)

- M.W. = M. Monier-Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Oxford, 1899.
- Nigh. = Nighaṇṭu ; ed. by S. Sīmaśrami as '*Nirukta*' Vol. I. (*Ref.* : Adh. Khaṇḍa).
- Nir. = Yāska's Nirukta ; ed. by Pt. Satyavrata Sāmaśrami in 4 volumes, Calcutta 1882-1891. (*Ref.* Adh. Pāda. Khaṇḍa).
- PaP = Padma-Purāṇa ; Ān. ed. (*Ref.* : Khaṇḍa [V=Sṛṣṭi-Khaṇḍa]. Adh. Śl.)
- PrādhR = 'Prādhānika Rahasya' appended to the 'Devī-Māhātmya' or 'Durgā-Saptaśatī' ; Gītā Press ed. (*Ref.* : Śloka).
- Rām. = Rāmāyaṇa ; M. L. J. Press, Madras, ed., 1958. (*Ref.* : Kāṇḍa [VI=Yuddha K.]. Adh. Śl.)
- ṚV = Ṛgveda. (*Ref.* : Maṇḍala, Sūkta, Ṛc).
- ŚB = Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa ; Acyuta-granthamālā ed., Kāśī. V. S. 1994-97. (*Ref.* : Kāṇḍa. Adhyāya. Brāhmaṇa. Khaṇḍa).
- SkP = Skanda-Purāṇa ; Venk. ed. (*Ref.* : Khaṇḍa [VI=Nāgara-Kh. ; VII=Prabhāsa-Kh.]. Adh. Śl.).
- SRUp. = Sarasvatī-Rahasya-Upaniṣad ; as included in the Nirṇaya Sāgara Pr. ed. of the 108 Upaniṣads, Bombay 1925.
- Tsār. = Tantra sāra of Kṛṣṇānanda ; Vahg. Press ed.
- VaikṛtR = 'Vaikṛtika Rahasya' appended to the 'Durgā-Saptaśatī' ; Gītā Press ed. (*Ref.* Śloka).
- VānP = Vāmana-Purāṇa ; Veāk. ed. (*Ref.* : Adh. Śl.).
- VS = Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā (Śukla-Yajurveda). (*Ref.* : Adh. Mantra)

#### Other Abbreviations :

- p = (after a śloka-number) *Pūrvārdha* or the first half of the śloka.
- u = (after a śloka-number) *Uttarārdha* or the second half of the śloka.
- पू = पूर्वार्द्ध of a śloka.
- उ = उत्तरार्द्ध of a śloka.

# THE PROBLEM OF GAṆEŚA IN THE PURĀṆAS

BY

JUAN ROGER RIVIERE

[ अस्मिन् निबन्धे डा० 'जुआन रोजर रिवरि' नाम्ना स्पेनदेशीयेन विदुषा महादेवसूनोः श्रीगणेशस्य मूलस्वरूपादिविषयका विचाराः प्रस्तुताः, कार्तिकेयगणपत्योश्च परस्परसम्बन्धस्य विषये तयोर्मूर्तीनां पूजादीनां च विषये विचारोद्बोधको विमर्शश्च कृतः । शिवस्य द्वौ पुत्रौ श्रूयते—स्कन्दो गणेशश्च । ख्रीस्ताब्दारम्भे स्कन्दोऽत्र भारते लोकप्रियो देव आसीत् । उपनिषदादिषु प्राचीनग्रन्थेष्वपि तस्योल्लेखः प्राप्यते । परन्त्वधुना स 'सुब्रह्मण्य' इति नाम्ना दक्षिणभारते एव प्रायशः पूज्यते । इतिहासपुराणेषु भगवतः शिवस्यापरोऽपि पुत्रो 'गणेश' इति नाम्ना श्रूयते । तैत्तिरीयारण्यकेऽपि 'वक्रनुण्ड' 'दन्ती' इति च विशेषणद्वयोपेतः कश्चिद्देवः प्रोक्तः । परन्तु महाभारते एव गणेशः प्रथमतः ख्यातिं गतः । स बुद्धिदेवता विघ्नेशश्च मन्यते । सर्वकार्यारम्भे च तस्य पूजा विहिता । ख्रीस्तीयकालस्य दशम्यां शत्यां गणपत्यसम्प्रदायस्य समुदय आसीत् । अस्मिन् सम्प्रदाये गणेश एव प्रधानदेवता, स एव तत्र परमात्मेति च मन्यते । अस्य सम्प्रदायस्य गणपतितापनोयोपनिषद्व्येका वर्तते, तथैव गणेशपुराणं नामैकमुपपुराणमपि प्राप्यते । गणेशस्य तस्य शक्तेश्च मूर्तयोऽपि 'एलोरा' प्रभृतिस्थानेषु प्राप्यन्ते । तिब्बतदेशे गणेशान्या अपि मूर्तयः प्राप्यन्ते । कुत्रचित् शिलामन्दिरेषु जैनैरपि स पूज्यते । महायानबौद्धेऽपि 'गणपतिहृदय' नाम्ना रहस्यात्मकेन मन्त्रेण गणपतेरुपासना प्रचलति । महायानबौद्धस्यायं गणपतिदेवताकः सम्प्रदायोऽधुनापि वर्मास्याम-तिब्बत-चीन-जापानादिदेशेषु विद्यते । एवं लोके गणेशः पूज्यतमेव न्यतमो देवो वर्तते । पुराणानां सम्यगव्ययनेन तस्य स्वरूपादिविकासविषयकमन्यदपि परमोपयोगि ज्ञानं प्राप्स्यते । ]

There is, in Indology, the problem of the origin of Śiva's son : *Gaṇeśa* or *Gaṇapati*. I think that some investigations in the Purāṇas could bring a bit of light on this obscure question. In fact, there is, by one side, the affirmation of the existence of a son of Śiva in the Upaniṣadic period : *Kartikēya* or *Skanda* and, on the other, the presence of a second son : *Gaṇeśa*, in the



historical period of India both in epics and *Purāṇas*. The development of the person and worship of this latter God, the animal-headed God of the Hindu pantheon, is mysterious. Can we suppose two sons of Śiva? Has Gaṇeśa kept some characteristics of his supposed brother? Has he supplanted the last one by an historical evolution?

Without going back to the *Sruti* and studying the evolution of the concept of *Sanat-kumāra*, "the eternal Son", called in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (VII, 25, 2) "The God of War", as does H Heras<sup>1</sup>, we can only note that this beautiful image of the "Son of God" is identified with the God *Skanda* by Śaṅkara in the *Bhāṣya* on the same Upaniṣad: "this *Sanat-kumāra* is called *Skanda* by the people who know his real character". Narayan Apte, in his commentary on the same Up. affirms also that *Sanat-kumāra* is the same as *Skanda* or *Kārtikeya*.<sup>2</sup>

*Skanda* (root *SKAND*—to leap) is the God of War—the planet Mars. According to the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, he is the son of Śiva. His name is found, for the first time, in the *Maitrayāṇi* and in the *Grhya-sūtra*. He has there a demoniac character and his servants are "the catchers". Śiva-Rudra produced him without the intervention of a woman, casting his seed into fire which was afterwards received by the Ganges; he is called for this reason *Agni-bhū* and *Gaṅgā-ja*. Fostered by the *Kṛtikāḥ* or Pleiades, hence he has six heads, *Ṣaṁmukha* and the name *Kārttikeya*. Patañjali calls him "he who has two-mothers, three mothers". He was born for the purpose of destroying *Tarakāsura*, a *Dvitya* whose austerities were dangerous for the Gods, according to the *Mahābh.*

He is called also *Kumāra*, the boy. There are many representations of this God seated on one of the knees of *Pārvatī* (Mahabalipuram and Madras Museum). He is a Brahmacārin. He is represented riding on a peacock called *Parayani*, his usual *vāhana*, holding a bow in one hand and an arrow in the other.

1. In *The Problem of Ganapati*, "Tamil Culture", III, 2 (April, 1954).

2. The *Viṅga Purāṇa* considers *Sanat-kumāra* as the first born of all the mind-born sons of Brahmā.

He has the appearance of a young man with one, six or twelve heads. The *Kumāratantra* speaks of sixteen distinct representations. He has many titles: as a warrior, he is called *Mahā-sena*, *Senā-pati*, *Sakti-dhara*, *Tārakājit*; he is *Gula* "the mysterious one". In the south of India, he is called *Su-Brahmaṇya* (see the poems of *Tiruppugal* by Aruṅgagirinadar) and was the *iṣṭa-devatā* of the Calukyās. His cult is very old in the Tamil-nadu and worshipped in the mountainous region of the Kuvaras. His main shrine is in Palni.

In the northern India, *Skanda* was very well known, and numismatic evidence shows him a popular God in the beginning of the Christian era (Banerjee, *the Development of Hindu Iconography*).

The Gupta family was much devoted to this deity, as among them two bear names of *Kumāra* and one *Skanda*. Notwithstanding, at a later period, devotion to him died out in northern India; it is odd that his terrible and fearful aspect predominates: Gopinatha Rao<sup>1</sup> affirms that in the Bombay State no woman whose husband is alive would ever visit a temple of *Kārtikeya Svāmī*. He is in fact now almost exclusively a South Indian deity. We have to lay aside the hypothesis of Prof. Kerbaker that *Skanda* was a popular form of *Soma* in relation with the mention of Dionysos by Megasthenes.

Now, in epics and *Purāṇas*, appears another son of Śiva: *Gaṇeśa* and that is the problem. This name appears for the first time in the *R̥gveda* (II, 23, 1) where Brahmapaspati is given the title of *Gaṇapati* (*Gaṇānām tvā Gaṇapatim havāmahe*). The *Gaṇa* forms the host of semigods, attendants of Śiva. Indra, in the *R̥g.* (X, 112, 9) is also called *Gaṇapati*; at a later period, the title went to Śiva, for in the epics, Śiva is called *Gaṇeśa* and *Gaṇeśvara*.

The *Taittirīyāranyaka* (X, i, 5) speaks of a God who possesses a twisted trunk (*valkratuṇḍu*) and is called *Dantīn* (the one having the tusk). But *Gaṇeśa* appears really in the *Mahābhārata*,

---

1. *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, II, 2, p. 415,

according to Winternitz. Bhandarkar<sup>1</sup> shows that in the *Smṛti* of *Yājñavalkya* (6th cent.), *Gaṇapati* is mentioned as a demon exalted to the rank of a deva and, in the 8th cent, "described as elephant-headed". Notwithstanding in the frieze round the Kantaka Cetinga stupa, near Mihintale, in Ceylon (1st and 2nd cent), there is a double procession of *gaja*, carrying gifts and converging to a central point, wherein there is another figure with the face of an elephant with his trunk turned to the left, as most of his images of a later period are<sup>2</sup>. *Gaṇeśa* appears as an attendant of Śiva, according to the rock-cut temples of Aihole. Hopkins notes<sup>3</sup> the affirmation of Manu : "*Sambhu* is the God of the Brāhmaṇas, while *Gaṇeśa* is the God of the Śūdras". Miss Getty concludes that it seems "to have been known to the uneducated classes upto the sixth century".

*Gaṇeśa* is the God of wisdom and remover of obstacle, being propitiated at the beginning of any special undertaking. His popularity is very extensive ; in the 10th century arose the sect of the *Gāṇapatya* with the *Sanḥkaradigvijaya* of Ānandatīrtha. For them, he was the supreme God, the first Cause, *Paramātman*. They had an Upaniṣad, the *Gaṇapatitāpanīya* (or *Varadatāpanīya*). The mantra of the *Gāṇapatyas* was *śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ*, and the sect seems to decay in the 12th century. Bhandarkar thinks that the active period of the sect was between the 5th and the 8th centuries.

We find *Gaṇapati* in many *Purāṇas* ; the *Agni P.* describes a ritual of *Gaṇeśa*. Others speak of him as a deity above the Trimūrti. The *Gaṇeśa P.*, an *Upapurāṇa*, condenses the theology and the cult of the God<sup>4</sup>. It was the influence of the *Gāṇapatyas* that introduced him with his myths into the last editions of the *Purāṇas*. The *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* contains

1. *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and other Minor Sects*, pp. 147-148.

2. Getty, *Gaṇeśa : A Monograph on the Elephant-faced God*, p. 25, pl. 22c (cited by H. Heras, *op. cit.*)

3. *Religions of India*, p. 487.

4. A good analysis of this *Upapurāṇa* is by Stevenson, *Analysis of the Gaṇeśa Purāṇa* in J.R.A.S., 1846, pp. 310-329.

many stories about him and equates him with *Kṛṣṇa*<sup>1</sup>; the *Vāmana P.* speaks of the origin of the God; the *Varāha P.* narrates his birth; the *Padma P.* describes his cult; the *Garuḍa P.* includes him among the five great Gods. The Hindu Architecture shows how his cult is popular; we find him in Tantrism, specially in the *Prapañcasāra Tantra*.

There are images of this God with his *Śakti* (Elloia); Miss Getty speaks of a female form of *Gaṇeśa*, a *Gaṇeśāni* at Bhera ghat, near Jubbulpore, whose left bent leg is supported by a small *Gaṇeśa*, half kneeling underneath. There are female forms of the God in Tibet, where he represents *Mahākāla* in the lamaic Buddhism. We find *Gaṇapati* worshipped by some Jainas in rock Temples. Heras writes that "the Museum of our Indian Historical Research Institute possesses a few metal images of *Gaṇeśa* which came from places of Jaina worship, among them one is of *Mahā-Gaṇapati* with his *Śakti*" (*op. cit.* p. 182). There is a cult of a mystic mantra, the *Gaṇapatihṛdaya*, in the *Mahāyāna* Buddhism, the mantra said to be given by the Buddha to Ānanda and to be used at the time of the dedication of an image of a dancing *Gaṇeśa*. The cult of the God through the *Mahāyāna* can be found in Buddhist countries, Burma, Siam, Nepal, Tibet, China, Japan, where there are many artistic creations of his figure on painting and sculpture. We have seen the twofold aspect of *Gaṇeśa* as a demon and a god. It is very interesting to find again this character in the Buddhism where he appears as *Vinataka* under the feet of the goddess *Aparājitā*, who is called *Gaṇapati-samākṛāntā* for this reason, or under the feet of the black *Mañjuśrī* of the lamaic pantheon; but he is also, as in India, *Vighneśa*, *Vighnahārīn*, the "remover of obstacles".

It is evident that this Śiva's son has adopted, little by little, many characteristics of his father; he has the *urdhva līṅga*, the third eye, three faces (Japan), five heads as *Heraṃba Gaṇapati* (Nepal), riding the lion of *Pārvatī*, with his *Śakti*, wearing a

---

1. There exists a *Gaṇeśa Gītā* in which the name of the God substitutes that of *Kṛṣṇa*.

*juṣṭā-mukha*, dancing the *Tāṇḍava* (*Nṛtta-Gaṇapati*) on one leg like Śiva ; he holds the trident, the *aṅkuṣa* and the rosary ; he is ornamented with skulls, symbol of Śiva as Destroyer. In the south his cult is very popular and Sitkanta Iyer writes that "Gaṇeśa has become the most popular of all the domestic deities of India".<sup>1</sup>

Now, if we return to *Kumāra*, his supposed brother, we find that the position of the two brothers is ambiguous. The second son of Śiva appears in the purāṇic and epic periods as an intruder ; in the images of the two brothers with *Pārvatī*, we find many times *Kārtikeya* seated on the lap of the Goddess and *Gaṇeśa* playing beside her, as affirms Miss Getty. Sometimes, the two brothers are next to each other in adoration in front of Śiva and *Pārvatī* (Elephanta). But, in the *Purāṇas*, there are many stories "in which Gaṇeśa fought with Skanda and emerged victorious, though with the loss of his tusk", as writes Venkata-kishna Rao<sup>2</sup>. The modern interpretations affirm that Gaṇeśa is the elder and *Skanda*, the younger ; this last one is always a war-god and symbolises the brutal, physical forces, the elder represents the spiritual forces which help the man to reach *mokṣa*. We can perceive the two ways of the confidence in the efficacy of the personal endeavour or the submission to the divine grace. Heras says that "in Northern India, Skanda, Kumāra or Kārttikeya is absolutely overlooked in the religious life of the people. For the majority of the people Śiva has only one son and that is Gaṇeśa or Gaṇapati. Accordingly he receives the titles of *Sivaputra*, *Sambhutanaya* and *Sambhusuta*" (op. cit. p. 195). This author quotes the *Skanda P.* which "depicts the crowds of unworthy people, *Sūdras* and barbarians worshipping Siya at Somnath in order to attain to the heavens of the *devas*. The minor deities headed by Indra protested to Mahēśvara. The latter then created Vināyaka, the Lord of obstacles, to impede those low people to enter heaven" (p. 195).

---

1. "The Popular view of Gaṇeśa in Madras", in "Indian Antiquary", XXX, p. 255.

2. *The Gaṇapati Cult* in Q. J. M. S. XLI, p. 94.

The Indologists have advanced some theories to explain the mystery of the origin of Gaṇeśa, this *Devai mātura*, 'having two mothers'. Miss Getty believes that he was primarily the totem of a Dravidian tribe, though there is no evidence of such a totem. Prof. Foucher thinks of an elephant-spirit of the jungle with a therianthropic evolution. Meyer affirms that it was a spirit of the fecundity and of the deads in connection with the "Mothers"; Grierson and Crooke believe in a solar hero of Dravidian origin. Coomara Swamy supposes that Gaṇeśa was a *Yakṣa*, one of the semigods attending on Kubera, but we do not find any of his names in the yakṣa lists, according to Miss Getty. The matter is more complicated, yet, because all the myths of his birth show that Gaṇeśa had originally a man's head which was substituted for the head of an elephant (*Brahmavaivarta P.*, *Siva P.*, *Varāha P.*). Heras and Zimmer think of a connection with the *Nāga* (the word means also elephant) tribes which were spread all over India; for them, the idea of giving the elephant-head to *Skanda*, the God of War, is not so extraordinary.

In any way, the mystery of Gaṇeśa remains. He has the original characteristics of *Siva* and *Skanda*, without any foundation in the *Veda*. I think that systematical studies of the *Purāṇas* could give some light on the problem of his origin. We must not forget that the *Purāṇas* were meant especially for the masses and represented the *Veda* for the laity. The characteristics of Gaṇeśa are eminently popular and his origins are surely humble and perhaps pre-Aryan; I think of a Dravidian or Indus valley origin. The *Purāṇas* occupy a very important position in the religious life of the Hindus as they have been, and are still the main sources of remote traditions in spite of the apocryphal character and revisions or modifications of some of them. I am sure that a detailed study of the Puranic references, special terminology and subject-concordance connected with Gaṇeśa could be useful to investigate the obscure origin of this popular God.

## भगवती लक्ष्मीः

( नरेन्द्रनाथ शर्मा चौधुरी )

[In this article the learned author has discussed the various aspects of Goddess *Lakṣmī* and her relation with *Viṣṇu*, *Sarasvatī* and *Uṣā*. *Lakṣmī* is regarded as the wife of *Viṣṇu*, and *Sarasvatī* has also been regarded as her co-wife. In the *R̥gveda* Goddess *Uṣā* has been conceived both as gold-coloured ( हिरण्यवर्णा ) and white coloured ( शुभ्रा ); gold-colour signifying her gold giving capacity, and the white colour her knowledge-bestowing capacity. In course of time the Vedic deity *Uṣā* evolved into the Purāṇic and Tāntric goddesses *Lakṣmī* (conceived as gold-coloured and wealth-bestowing), and *Sarasvatī* (conceived as white-coloured, and bestower of knowledge).

The worship of *Lakṣmī* has been prescribed on the occasions of the *Kojāgara-Pūṇimā* of the lunar month *Āśvina*, and the *Dīpāvalī-Amāvasyā* (of the *Kārtika* month). The author has criticised the custom of gambling on the occasions of *Lakṣmī*-worship, although it has been prescribed by *Raghunandana* in his *Tithitattva*. The custom might be due to a confusion between the *akṣas* (the casts of gambling) and the *akṣamālā* (which really means 'rosary') of Goddess *Lakṣmī*. On account of her wealth-bestowing capacity *Lakṣmī* has also been associated with *Kubera* whose worship is recommended along with the worship of *Lakṣmī*.]

भगवत्या लक्ष्म्याः प्रसिद्धिरस्मिन् भारते वर्षे सुतरां सर्वत्रैव वर्तते ।  
ऋग्वेदस्य खिले श्रीसूक्ते, सौभाग्यलक्ष्म्युपनिषदादिषु च देवीयं सम्यक् समाम्नायते ।

अस्याः पूजनं माहात्म्यं च पुराणे तन्त्रेऽपि विशेषेण वर्णितमस्ति । “लक्ष्मीः पद्मालया पद्मा कमला श्रीर्हरिप्रिया” ( १-४-५४ ) इत्यादयोऽस्या अमरकोषधृता वाचकाः शब्दाः । तेषु च श्रीरिति नाम नितरां प्रसिद्धयति ।

अथास्याः पुराणे तन्त्रे च वर्णनं कीदृशम् ? किं वा तस्य तात्पर्यम् ? कश्चास्याः सम्बन्धः सरस्वत्या, विष्णुना, उषसा च ? किंचास्यास्तत्त्वं रहस्यं च ? इत्येतत्सर्वमत्र समासेन विविच्यते ।

लक्ष्मीः खलु समुद्रमन्थनसमये प्रादुरभूदिति शास्त्रे समीरितम् । अत्र भारतम्—“श्रीरनन्तरमुत्पन्ना धृतात् पाण्डुरवासिनी” । ( १-१८-३५ ) अत्र भागवतं च ।

“ततश्चाविरभूत्साक्षाच्छ्री रमा भगवत्प्रिया” । ( ८-८-८ )

अथ कीदृशमस्या रूपमित्यत्र स्मार्त-रघुनन्दनस्य तिथितत्त्वे कोजागरकृत्ये आदित्यपुराणधृतं ध्यानं यथा—

“पाशाक्षमालिकाम्भोजसृणिभिर्याम्यसौम्ययोः ।

पद्मासनस्थां ध्यायेच्च श्रियं त्रैलोक्यमातरम् ॥

गौरवर्णां सुरूपां च सर्वालङ्कारभूषिताम् ।

रौक्मपद्मव्यग्रकरां वरदां दक्षिणेन तु” ॥

( चण्डीचरणस्मृतिभूषणप्रकाशितं तिथितत्त्वं, कोजागर-कृत्यम्, पृष्ठांकाः ३८१ )

ध्यानादस्मादवगम्यते यद् भगवतीर्यं पद्मासनस्था, गौरवर्णा, हस्तद्वयेन केषांचिन्मते हस्तचतुष्टयेन वा पाशं, रुद्राक्षजपमालां, पद्ममङ्कुशं च बिभर्ति । परमेतत् सर्वमेतस्याः कर्मजातं हि प्रकटीकरोति । तथा हि लक्ष्मीतो जनानां मायाबन्धनं पाशेन, धर्मादिकर्म च रुद्राक्षजपमालया, सौन्दर्यसम्पदानन्द-वर्धनं च पद्मेन, दुःखोत्पादनं चाङ्कुशेन व्यज्यते । एवं च भगवतीर्यं धनादिदेवता वर्तते । ततश्च धनाद् यथा बन्धनं दुःखं च भवति, तथा धर्मः सुखमानन्दं च सञ्जायते । इत्येव ध्यानेनानेन सूचितम् ।

इयं हि देवी लक्षयति पश्यति प्रसन्ना प्रपन्नमिति लक्ष्मीः, श्रयति वा विष्णुमिति श्रीश्च निगद्यते ।



“श्री” इत्यस्याः प्रसिद्धो बीजमन्त्रः । ध्यानेन यद्रूपमुपतिष्ठते तदेव बीजमन्त्रार्थः ।

एषा तावद् विष्णोर्नारायणस्य पत्नीति गीयते । अस्याः सपत्नी वाग्देवी सरस्वती वर्तते ।

अथ लक्ष्मीः खलु चान्द्राश्विनमासस्य कोजागरपौर्णमास्यां विशेषेण समर्च्यते । तस्यां रात्रौ अक्षैर्जागरणं च शास्त्रे विहितम् । यथा तिथितत्त्वे कोजागर-कृत्ये रघुनन्दनः—“अक्षैर्जागरणं चरेत्” ( चण्डीचरणस्मृतिभूषणप्रकाशितं तिथितत्त्वं कोजागरकृत्यम्, पृष्ठांकाः ३८० ) यथा च पुनस्तत्रैव—

“निशीथे वरदा लक्ष्मीः को जागर्ताति भाषिणी ।

तस्मै विचं प्रयच्छामि अक्षैः क्रीडां करोति यः । ( पृ० ३८०-३८१ )

परं विधानमेतत् दुर्विधानमिवाभाति । तथा हि ऋग्वेदेऽपि अक्षसूक्तं वर्तते, सत्यम्, किन्तु तत्र अक्षनिन्दैव कृता वेदपुरुषेण, अक्षक्रीडा च निषिद्धा; यथा—“अक्षैर्मा दीव्यः कृषिमित् कृषस्व” ( १०-३४-१३ ) । श्रीमहाभारतेऽपि सभापर्वणि अष्टपंचादशाऽध्याये दुरोदरस्य निन्दैव विहिता भगवता व्यासेन; यथा—“धूतमनर्थमूलम्” ( ११ ), यथा च पुनस्तत्रैव एकोनषष्ठितमेऽध्याये—“देवनं पापम्” ( ५ ); तथापि कोजागर-रात्रौ कथङ्कारं विहिताक्षक्रीडेति विचित्रमिवैतत् प्रतिभाति । परमत्रैतत् सम्भाव्यते यत् पुराणे वर्णिताया लक्ष्मीदेव्या हस्ते स्थिताक्षमालिकैव विधानस्यास्य हेतुः । किन्तु पूर्वमेतदुक्तमेव यत् साक्षमालिका तत्त्वतो रुद्राक्षमालैवास्ति, न तु धूताक्षाः । अतएव विधिरथं श्रुति-भारतादिस्मृतिविरुद्धः स्वार्थसिद्ध्यर्थं केनचित् प्रक्षिप्त इवेति समामनन्ति विद्वांसः ।

एवं च लक्ष्मीः दीपान्वितायाममावास्यायामपि प्रदोषे पूज्यते, यतस्तस्यामेव रात्रौ महाप्रलयात् परं महाशक्तिः पुनः सृष्ट्यर्थं प्रादुरभूत् ।

अथ लक्ष्मीदेव्या साकं कुबेरस्यापि शास्त्रे पूजा विहिता । कुबेरः खलु मुनेर्विश्रवसः—“इडविडा”—नामधेयायां “मिलविला”—नामधेयायां वा भार्यायां जातः पुत्रः । अयं हि धनाधिपस्यम्बकसलो यक्षराजश्चास्ति । निकषा-नन्दनस्य राक्षसराजस्य रावणस्यायं वैमात्रेयो आता च वर्तते । कुस्तिताङ्गः कुङ्भी

चेति कुबेर इति नाम्नायं व्यपदिश्यते । परन्तु लक्ष्मीदेव्याः भाषाकथायामुक्तं यत् कुबेरः लक्ष्मीनारायणयोः पुत्रोऽस्तीति । किमिदम् ? किं वा चास्य मूलम् ? उच्यते । धनसम्बन्धाद् धनाधिपः कुबेरोऽपि धनाधिदेवताया लक्ष्म्याः कालक्रमेण लोके पुत्रत्वं लभित इत्येव संगच्छते । अन्यथा यक्षराजस्य नरवाहनस्य मनुष्यधर्मणः कुबेरस्य लक्ष्मीनारायणयोः पुत्रत्वं दुरुपपादमेव विद्यते । किञ्च ऋग्वेदस्य खिले श्रीसूक्ते देवसखः ( शिवसखः ) इति नाम्ना कुबेरः श्रूयते “श्रीद” इति नाम कश्चिद् ऋषिश्च लक्ष्म्याः पुत्र इति चाम्नायते । “श्रीद” इति कुबेरस्य नामान्तरमिति च कोषतो ज्ञायते । अतः कुबेरस्यापि कथञ्चित् लक्ष्म्याः पुत्रत्वं श्रुतिसिद्धमेवास्तीति मा वोचः, यतः श्रीदस्य श्रीसूक्ते ऋषित्वेन श्रुतत्वात्, कुबेरस्य तु तथा प्रसिद्धत्वाच्चेति दिक् ।

अथ कुत्रेयं लक्ष्मीः प्रतिवसतीति प्रश्ने श्रीमहाभारते, अनुशासनपर्वणि, एकादशेऽध्याये लक्ष्मीवाक्यम्—

“वसामि नित्यं सुभगे प्रगल्भे, दक्षे नरे कर्मसु विद्यमाने ।

अक्रोधने देवपरे कृतज्ञे जितेन्द्रिये नित्यसुदीर्णसत्त्वे ॥” (६)

यथार्थमेतत् । ईदृश एव जनो लक्ष्म्याः परं भाजनं भवति । जगत्पस्मिन् समृद्धये सत्यं प्रणिधातव्यमेतदस्ति ।

अथ तन्त्र-शास्त्रे श्रीलक्ष्मीः कमला वा, काल्यादिमहाविद्यास्वन्यतमा विद्यते । इयं हि काञ्चनसन्निभा, सिन्दूरारुणकान्तिर्वा चकास्ति । चतुर्भिर्गजैर्हस्ताक्षिप्त-हिरण्यकृतघटैरासिच्यमाना, चतुर्भुजा च वर्तते । अस्या अष्टौ शक्तयः सन्ति । तासु च उषा देवी सरस्वती चान्यतमा विद्यते । यथा वैष्णवचरणप्रकाशिते कृष्णानन्दस्य तन्त्रसारे महालक्ष्मीमन्त्रप्रकरणे—

“उमाद्याः पत्रमध्यस्था शक्तीरष्टौ यजेत् क्रमात् ।

अथोमा श्रीसरस्वत्यौ दुर्गा धरणि संयुता ।

गायत्री देव्युषा चेति पद्महस्ता सुशोभना ॥ इति (पृष्ठांका १३०)

न केवलं धनार्थिना, विद्यार्थिनापि सदेयं सेव्या ध्यातव्या चार्कमण्डले इत्यपि तन्त्रसारे लक्ष्मीकवचे, लक्ष्मीप्रयोगे चोक्तम् (पृष्ठांकाः ४१९, ४७३)

अथ सरस्वत्या अपि मार्तण्डमण्डल एव ध्यानं तन्त्रसारे सरस्वतीप्रयोगे ( पृष्ठांकाः ४७३ ) विहितम् । इयं च सरस्वती देवी शुभकान्तिः, सिताब्जे निषण्णा, विद्याधिदेवता, विद्यादायिनी, सकलविभव-सिद्धिदा च प्रोक्ता । यथा सरस्वती लक्ष्म्याः शक्तिस्तथा लक्ष्मीरपि सरस्वत्यास्तनुर्वर्तते । यथा तिथितत्त्वे पञ्चमीप्रकरणे—

“लक्ष्मीर्मेधा धरा पुष्टि गौरी तुष्टिः प्रभा धृतिः

एताभिः पाहि तनुभिरष्टभिर्मां सरस्वति ॥” ( पृष्ठा० १३८-१३९ )

अपि च श्रीशब्दो यथा लक्ष्मीवाचकस्तथा सरस्वतीवाचकोऽपि । अत्र खलु तिथितत्त्वे—( पृष्ठांकाः १३६ ) “पञ्चम्यां श्रीरपि श्रियम् ॥” इति,

“पञ्चम्यां पूजयेल्लक्ष्मीं पुष्पधूपान्नवारिभिः ।

मस्याधारं लेखनीं च पूजयेन्न लिखेतततः ॥

माघे मासि सिते पक्षे पञ्चमी या श्रियः प्रिया ।

तस्यां पूर्वाह्ण एवेह कार्यः सारस्वतोत्सवः ॥”

( पृष्ठांकाः, १३६-१३८ ) इति च शास्त्रवचनं समुद्धृत्य,

“लक्ष्मी-सरस्वती-धी-त्रिवर्ग-सम्पद्-विभूति-शोभासु ।

उपकरण-वेशरचनासु च श्रीरिति प्रथिता ।”

इति व्याङ्गिकोषं च प्रदर्श्य स्मार्तेन रघुतन्दनेनापि श्रीशब्दस्य सरस्वतीपरत्वमपि सुप्रतिपादितमस्ति ।

अथैतेभ्यो वचनादिभ्यः स्पष्टमिदं प्रतीयते यद् वेदस्य काचित् सूर्यमण्डल सम्बन्धिनी प्रसिद्धैव देवी महाभाग्यात् कर्मपृथक्त्वात् पुराणे तन्त्रे च लक्ष्मीनाम्ना सरस्वतीनाम्ना च रूपभेदेन च पृथक् पूज्यते । परं नास्त्यनयोस्तत्त्वतः कश्चिद् भेदः । अन्यथानयोरुभयोः सूर्यमण्डलसम्बन्धः श्रीप्रभृति—नामधेयसाम्यं कर्मविशेषादिसाम्यं च नोपपद्यते ।

अथ कासौ महाभागा वैदिकी देवी या पुराणे तन्त्रे च लक्ष्मीः सरस्वती च सञ्जातेति प्रश्ने प्रोच्यते—वैदिकी उषा एव सा देवता चकास्ति । कथम् ? श्रूयताम् । ऋग्वेदे लक्ष्मीशब्दः खलु “सक्तुमिव तितउना” इत्यादिमन्त्रे “भद्रैषां लक्ष्मीर्निहिताधिवाचि ।” ( १०-७१-२ ) इत्यत्र सकृदेव श्रूयते । न तत्रास्ति

श्रीसूक्तं न वा लक्ष्मीसूक्तम् । यत्सरस्वतीसूक्तम् ऋग्वेदे दृश्यते तत्तु नदीपरं न तु विद्यादेवी परमिति तु निर्विवादमेव । परं तत्र खिलभागे श्रीसूक्तमेकमवश्यं वर्तते । तत्तु पश्चात् संयोजितमिति तस्य खिलनाम्ना सिद्धमेव । परन्तु ऋग्वेदे भगवतो उषादेवी खलु सुप्रसिद्धा । सा च “हिरण्यवर्णा” ( ७-७०-२ ) “शुभ्रा” ( ४-५१-६ ) चेति, “रेवती” ( ३-६१-६ ) “प्रचेताश्चेति” ( ३-६१-१ ), “सूर्यस्य योषा” ( ७-७५-५ ) चेति च वर्ण्यते । अतएव दृश्यते यत् उषा लक्ष्मीवत् सुवर्णवर्णा, सरस्वतीवत् शुभ्रवर्णा च । इयं न केवलं धनाधिदेवता, ज्ञानाधिदेवता च । लक्ष्मीवदस्याः प्रधानं कर्म न केवलं धनदानं, परन्तु सरस्वतीवत् ज्ञानदानं च । इयं च सूर्यस्य पत्नी । अतोऽस्या अपरं नाम “सूर्या” इति श्रूयते । अत्र यास्कः—“सूर्या सूर्यस्य पत्नी । एषैवाभि सृष्टकालतमा ।” ( निरुक्तम्, १२-७-२ ) अस्य व्याख्याने दुर्गः—“एषैव उषाः अभिसृष्टकालतमा यथा सूर्यस्योदयकालं प्रत्यभिसृष्टतमा भवति गततमा भवति, तथा तथा सैषा उषाः सूर्या सम्पद्यते ।” इत्थमवदातमेतद् यत् उषा देवी, वैदिकस्य विष्णोःपत्नी, ध्यानादिसौकर्यार्थं पूजादिसौकर्यार्थं च, सुवर्णवर्णेन समं सुवर्णादिरूपस्य धनस्य, शुभ्रवर्णेन च समं निर्मलस्य ज्ञानस्य च संयोजनेन, पुराणे तन्त्रे च लक्ष्मीः सरस्वती च सम्पन्ना । तेन च, वेदे सत्यामपि प्रसिद्धयो, उषादेवी पुराणे तन्त्रे च, तेन रूपेण न पूज्यते न वा दृश्यते, यतः खल्वियं तत्र रूपान्तरमेव प्राप्ता, अतएव पुनस्तत्र उषोरूपेणाविर्भावस्यावश्यकतैव नालोक्यते । मतस्यास्य पुष्टिः खलु ऋग्वेदस्य खिलात् श्रीसूक्तात् सुतरां जायते । तथा च श्रीसूक्ते श्रूयते—

“चन्द्रां हिरण्मयीं लक्ष्मीं जातवेदो म आवह ।”

अन्यच्च—“श्रियं देवीमुपह्वये ।”

अपरं च—“आदित्यवर्णे ।”

किञ्च—“सूर्या हिरण्मयीं लक्ष्मीं जातवेदो म आवह ।”

अपि च—महालक्ष्म्यै च विद्महे विष्णुपत्न्यै च धीमहि । तन्नो लक्ष्मीः प्रचोदयात् ।

अथैतेभ्यः श्रीसूक्तश्रुतिवाक्येभ्यो विज्ञायते यत् श्रीलक्ष्मीर्महालक्ष्मीश्चैका एव देवता । इयं हि हिरण्यवर्णा, आदित्यवर्णा, शुभ्रवर्णा च । इयं पुनः सूर्यस्य पत्नी सूर्या, विष्णुपत्नी च ।

एवञ्चानेन लक्ष्म्या वैशिष्ट्येन सममत्र द्रष्टव्यं यन्महाभागा भगवती उषा-  
देव्यपि नभसि, प्रकृत्या, प्रतिदिनं, प्रत्युषः, हिरण्यवर्णा, ततश्चादित्यवर्णा,  
तदनन्तरं च शुभ्रवर्णा समालोक्यते । इयं पुनर्मध्याकाशवर्तिनो विष्णुसंज्ञकस्य  
सूर्यस्य पत्नी सूर्या इति च श्रूयते । अपि च भगवतोयं विभातसमये सवनादिकर्मसु  
प्रेरणाद् धनं, ततश्च स्वाध्यायादिकर्मसु प्रेरणाच्च ज्ञानं जनयति । अतएव  
इयमेव वर्णकमादिभेदाद् उषसि लक्ष्मीरूपं, ततश्च सरस्वतीरूपं प्रतिपद्यते तेन च  
लक्ष्मीसरस्वत्योः सूर्यमण्डलस्सम्बन्धिदेवतात्वं, परस्परशक्तित्वं, नामाद्यभेदश्चोप-  
पद्यते । एवञ्च लक्ष्म्याः काञ्चनकान्तित्वं, सिन्दूरारुणकान्तित्वं च, तथा  
प्रभातकिरणतोयैर्दिग्गजासिच्यमानमूर्तित्वम्, उषसः शक्तित्वं च सर्वं सुसमञ्जसमेव  
भवति । अपरं च तमः-समुद्रात् प्रातरुषसः प्रादुर्भाव एव समुद्रमन्थनात्  
लक्ष्म्या आविर्भावरूपेण पुराणे वर्णित एव इति यत् तदपि सुवचमेव भवति ।  
इत्थं च “इदं विष्णुर्विचक्रमे त्रेधा निदधे पदम्” इति श्रुत्या ऋग्वेदस्थया  
( १-२२-१७ ) प्रतिपादितो मध्याकाशवर्तिसूर्याभिन्नो विष्णुरेव पुराणे उषसः  
खल्वभिन्नाया लक्ष्म्याः सरस्वत्याश्च पतिरूपेणोपवर्ण्यते । अथ किं स्वरूपः  
खलु पौराणिकोऽयं विष्णुरिति प्रश्ने प्रसिद्धायां पूजापद्धतौ विष्णोर्ध्यानं यथा—

“विष्णुं पीतवाससं चतुर्भुजं वनमालाविभूषितम् ।

लक्ष्मीसरस्वतीकान्तं गरुडासनमाश्रमे” ॥

एवं च पौराणिकस्य विष्णोः सूर्याभिन्नत्वं विष्णोः रूपान्तरभूतस्य नारायणस्य  
प्रसिद्धात् ध्यानात् सम्यक् प्रतीयते । यथा—

“ध्येयः सदा सचित्तमण्डलमध्यवर्ती नारायणः” । इति ।

अपि च—“इदं विष्णुर्विचक्रमे” इति ऋग्वेद-श्रुतौ विष्णोस्त्रिधा पदनिधानं  
खलु शाकपुण्यादिभिर्मनीषिभिर्भिन्नरूपेणैवाकलितं वर्णितं च । अथ एतदेव  
विष्णोः पदत्रयनिधानं किञ्चिद् रूपान्तरं पुराणे वामनबलिसंवादे धृतवामनरूपे

विष्णौ प्राप्तम् । अतएव देव्या उषसः पतिर्वैदिको विष्णुरेव पुराणे तन्त्रे च उषसस्तावदभिन्नाया लक्ष्म्याः सरस्वत्याश्च बलभवमवाप्त इत्यादि सर्वं शास्त्रदृष्ट्या सुश्लिष्टमेवोपपन्नम् ।

अथ लौकिकदृष्ट्या देव्या उषसः पुराणे तन्त्रे च रूपद्वयस्य किं कारणमित्यस्य निपुणं विचारे क्रियमाणे दृश्यतेऽस्माभिर्यत् सम्प्रदायादिविद्वेषादिकमप्यत्र किल कारणं भवेत् । पुरा पौराणिकयुगप्रारम्भे भारतवर्षे धनिसम्प्रदायस्य ज्ञानिसम्प्रदायस्य च मध्ये तथा नाम वैमनस्यमासीद् यथा सम्प्रदायद्वयेन न पुनर्यथा पुरा धनाय ज्ञानाय च एकस्या एव देवताया उषसः समभ्यर्चनं सम्भवमभूत् । तेन च महाभाष्यात् कर्मपृथक्त्वाद्वा लक्ष्मीरूपेण सरस्वतीरूपेण च रूपद्वयमुषसः सम्प्रदायद्वयेन स्वार्थसिद्धये प्रकल्पितम् । एवं च सपत्नीत्वेन लक्ष्म्याः सरस्वत्याश्च कल्पनया तयोरेकत्रावस्थानं खलु दुष्करमिव समपद्यत । इत्थं धनिसम्प्रदायस्य ज्ञानिसम्प्रदायस्य च मध्ये सौमनस्याभावेन देवताभेदाद् देशस्य, समाजस्य, जनगणस्य च समभ्युदयो व्याहृत एव समजनि । इदमवितर्कं यदनयोः सम्प्रदाययोर्मध्ये सौहार्दे सत्येव सर्वत्र भद्रमनामयं शान्तिश्च सम्भवति । तदेव च देशस्य समाजस्य च नेतृणां कवीनां च परमं काम्यमासीत् । परं तत्तथा तदानावर्तत । एतत्सर्वं संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्य सम्यगध्ययनादवदातमेव सम्पद्यते । बहोः कालात्पूर्वमाविर्भूतेन कविना कालिदासेनापि सर्वमेतदन्तराऽन्तरा समासेन सुष्ठु प्रकटीकृतम् । तथा चोक्तं तेन विक्रमोर्वशीये—

“परस्परविरोधिन्योरेकसंश्रयदुर्लभम् ।

सङ्गतं श्रीसरस्वत्योर्भूयादुद्भूतये सताम् ॥ ( ५-२४ )

इत्थं धनिज्ञानिसम्प्रदायविरोधोऽपि तावदुषसः पौराणिके युगे मूर्तिद्वयग्रहणस्य निदानान्तरं स्यादिति मतं युक्तियुक्तमिव प्रतिभाति ।

अथ लक्ष्म्याः किं तत्त्वं, किं वा रहस्यमिति प्रश्ने वदामो यदियं लक्ष्मीः खलु तत्त्वतः कालशक्तेः काल्याः कर्मभेदात् कमलामूर्त्या रूपान्तरमेवास्ति । इयं भगवतः सूर्यस्य पराशक्तिः, पत्नीरूपा, सरस्वत्यभिन्ना, श्रीमदुषसः परिणामभूता, भद्रकाली, धनारोग्यविद्यानन्दकरी, परमेश्वरी, विभातसमये प्रतिदिनमाविर्भूय,

सर्वेभ्यः सुतरां श्रेयः प्रेयश्च वितरति । एषा खलु यथार्थतो नैव स्त्री न वा पुमान् वर्तते तथापि महादेवीयं साधकानां साधनादिसौकर्यार्थं, मातृरूपेणानिशं ध्यायते पूज्यते च । अस्याः स्वरूपस्यास्य विज्ञानेन साधकस्य शक्त्यभिन्न ब्रह्मरूपत्वमेव सिध्यति । अथैतदेव भगवत्या लक्ष्म्यास्तत्त्वं रहस्यं च विभाति ।

## पुराण-रत्नानि

सम्पदां हेतुभूता च विपत्तिः सर्वदेहिनाम् ।

विना विपत्तेर्महिमा केषां पद्मे भवेद्भवे ॥

( ब्रह्मवैवर्त०, आनन्दाश्रम०, २।६।९० )

चेदस्ति शक्तिर्द्रव्यदाने ततस्ते,

दातव्यमेवार्थिने किं विचार्यम् ।

नो चेत्सन्तः परकार्याणि कुर्यु-

र्वाग्भिर्मनोभिः कृतिभिस्तथैव ॥

( ब्रह्मपुराण, वैकटेश्वर०, गौत० मा०, ४०।३९ )

THE GEOGRAPHICAL TEXT OF THE PURĀṆAS :  
A FURTHER CRITICAL STUDY.

By C. A. LEWIS

[ अस्मिन् निबन्धे श्री 'लैविस' उपाद्धेन आङ्ग्लविदुषा पुराण-भुवनकोशप्रकरणेषु प्रोक्तानां जनपदानां जातीनां च विषये गवेषणापूर्णा विमर्शः कृतः । पुराणेषु मध्यदेश-उदीच्य-प्राच्य-दक्षिणापथ-अपरान्त-विन्ध्य-हिमालयवर्तिनां जनपदानां वर्णनमुपलभ्यते । तत्र द्विविधो भुवनकोशग्रन्थः पुराणेषु प्राप्यते - क्वचित् संक्षिप्तः, क्वचिच्च विस्तृतः । संक्षिप्तग्रन्थस्य विस्तृतग्रन्थे एवान्तर्भूतत्वात् भुवनकोशस्य विस्तृतग्रन्थ एवात्र विचार्यते । जर्मनीदेशीयेन श्रीकिरफिलमहोदयेन पुराणान्तर्गत-भुवनकोश-ग्रन्थानां यः पाठो निर्धारितः, श्रीदिनेशचन्द्रसरकारमहोदयेन च तथैव भुवनकोशग्रन्थानां यः पाठो निर्णीतः, तादृभौ पाठौ समाश्रित्य लेखकमहोदयेनात्र भुवनकोशविषयका विचाराः प्रकटीकृताः, उभाभ्यां विद्वद्भ्यां निर्धारितानां पाठानां च सम्यक् समालोचनं विधाय शुद्धपाठ-विषये स्वमतोऽपि प्रदर्शितः । भुवनकोशप्रकरणेषु प्रोक्तानां जनपदानां च कैश्चिदाधुनिकैर्जनपदैः सहामेदोऽपि तेन प्रतिपादितः । एतादृशेऽमेद-प्रतिपादने पाठनिर्धारणे च विदुषा लेखकेन बहूनां पुराणोत्तर-प्राचीनग्रन्थानां प्रमाणान्यप्युद्धृतानि । ]

The objective of this essay will be a detailed analysis and comparative study of the so-called Bhuvana-kosa geographical lists which occur in several of the purāṇas. As is well known, in these texts the various peoples are grouped according to their position into one of seven specific divisions, i.e. the Central division (Madhya-deśa), the Northern (Uttarāpatha), the Eastern (Pṛācya), the Southern (Dakṣiṇāpatha), the Western (Aparānta), the Vindhya and the Himalayan. There are two types of Bhuvana-kośa text, the first consisting of an extremely short list of names, but specifying the directions, while the second comprises a much longer text with the same directions as the shorter text but with the welcome addition of many more names. The sources for the shorter text are Viṣṇu-purāṇa II. 3. 1-19; Kūrma-purāṇa I. 47. 20-42; Śiva-purāṇa 18. 1-15; and Agni-purāṇa 118, 1-8. The longer text occurs in Mār-



kaṇḍeya-purāṇa 57. 32-58; Bṛahmaṇḍa-purāṇa I. 16. 40-69; Matsya-purāṇa 114. 34-57; Vāyu-purāṇa 45. 109-137; Brahma-purāṇa 27. 41-70; and Vāmana-purāṇa 13. 36-58. As the longer texts include all the geographical data of the shorter texts, they alone need to be examined.

The great value of these Bhuvana-kośa lists as a source for the study of ancient Indian geography was recognised as long ago as 1885 by Burgess who suggested that lists of names contained in the purāṇas should be prepared "as a means to the better elucidation of the ancient geography of India" (I. A. XIV. 319-322). Before this can be achieved however, there are several intrinsic defects in the texts themselves, which will considerably diminish their value unless they can be removed, the foremost being the widespread textual corruption which must be eliminated before any identification with modern place-names can be attempted. A comparison of the different purāṇic texts makes it clear that despite their considerable individual variations of reading they are all nevertheless derived from one original source. Accordingly, both W. Kirfel (*Das Purāṇa von Weltgebaude*, Bonn, 1954, p. 112ff),<sup>1</sup> and D. C. Sircar (I.H.Q. xxi, p. 267 ff) have made independent critical studies of the geographical purāṇic texts, and have established their own texts which however not infrequently differ from one another. The purpose of the present article therefore is to go one step further by a comparative study of the results of these two scholars both in the light of their own conclusions and those able to be made by a comparison of their texts with any relevant external evidence. The importance of the investigation of other independent geographical sources in an effort to discover names similar to these that occur in one or more of the Bhuvana-Kośa lists cannot be stressed too highly, for the discovery of such a name in another context at once establishes that it is very probably authentic and not a product of textual corruption.

---

1. This text is a slightly different version from that originally published in an earlier critical study by the same author, i.e. *Bhāratavarṣa (Indien) Textgeschichtliche Darstellung zweier geographischen purāṇa-Texte nebst Übersetzung*. Stuttgart. 1931.

This being the case only then may we proceed to attempt to identify it with the name of some modern locality if sufficient philological or geographical data is available for this purpose.

Since it would be a cumbrous procedure to list both the texts of Kirfel and Sircar in full and then compare and contrast them, it has been thought more practicable to divide them into various sections according to the directions they employ, and so discuss all the geographical names of one specific division at the same time. This method, it is hoped, will result in making the materials less unwieldy to handle and in facilitating easier reference to them. As regards the identification of these tribal names only the salient features supporting the identification will be given; for more detailed information one may consult the geographical dictionaries of N. L. Dey<sup>2</sup> and B. C. Law<sup>3</sup> or the recently published study by S. B. Chaudhuri<sup>4</sup>. The primary aim of the present thesis is to establish the correct text as far as is practicable.

#### MADHYA-DEŚA

##### Kirfel's Text

tāsv ime : Kuru-Pāñcālāḥ Śalvā Mādreyā-Jāṅgalāḥ  
 Śurasenā Bhadrakārā Bodhāḥ saha-Paṭaccarāḥ  
 Matsyāḥ Kuśalyāḥ Kulyās ca Kuntalāḥ Kāśi-Kośalāḥ  
 Atharvās ca Kalīṅgās ca Magadhās ca Vṛkaiḥ saha  
 Madhyadeśyā janapadāḥ prāyaśo 'mī prakīrtitāḥ

##### Sircar's Text

tāsv ime Kuru-Pāñcālāḥ Śalvās caiva sa-Jāṅgalāḥ  
 Śurasenā Bhadrakārā Bodhāḥ saha-Paṭaccarāḥ  
 (Yodhāḥ saha—, Yaudheyāḥ sa—)  
 Matsyāḥ Kirātāḥ Kulyās ca Kuntayāḥ Kāśi-Kośalāḥ  
 Āvantās ca Bhulīṅgās ca Magadhās cĀndhakaiḥ saha  
 Madhyadeśyā janapadāḥ prāyaśo 'mī prakīrtitāḥ

2. N. L. Dey. The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India. Second edition. London, 1927.

3. B. C. Law. Historical Geography of Ancient India. Paris, 1951.

4. S. B. Chaudhuri. Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India. Part I. Calcutta, 1955.

An examination of the above texts shows the following variations ;

(1) K. Mādreya. S. caiva sa ; (2) K. Bodha. S. Bodha, but ? Yodha/Yaudheya ; (3) K. Kuśalya. S. Kirāta ; (4) K. Kuntala. S. Kunti ; (5) K. Atharva. S. Āvanta ; (6) K. Kaliṅga. S. Bhuliṅga ; (7) K. Vṛka. S. Andhaka.

(1) Mādreya/caiva sa. Mādreya is mentioned by two independent sources, the Mahābhārata (6.10.37) where it is placed in exactly the same position as in Kirfel's text between the Śālvas and the Jāṅgalas, and the Parīśiṣṭa to the Atharva-veda (56.4.) where it is located in the South-East between, Sajjapura and Tāmralipta (mod. Tamluk in the Midnapur District of W. Bengal). In view of the conflicting positions assigned to the Mādreyas by the Purāṇic and Parīśiṣṭa texts one must either assume that they migrated from Madhya-deśa to Bengal at some period, or alternately the existence of two separate tribes of Mādreya may also be regarded as a metonymic of Nakula and Sahadeva, i.e. sons of Mādrī. Accordingly it seems preferable to follow Kirfel's text and retain Mādreya, as two independent texts establish that a tribe of such a name did exist.

(2) Bodha/Bodha (? Yodha or Yaudheya). Sircar's efforts to include the Yaudheyas in the text are unnecessary. The authenticity of the Bodhas is established by the indisputable authority of Patañjali, who twice mentions them in association with the Audumbaras (MB, II. 4. 58, I. 4. 89). As the latter are known from the evidence of the Kāśikā commentary on Pāṇini's Aṣṭadhyāyī IV. 1. 173 and Yādavāprakāśa's Vaijayantī (p. 37. śl. 38) to be a member of the Śālva confederacy the location of Bodhas in Madhya-deśa is decisive. The Bodhas are also mentioned along with the Śurasenas, Śālvas, Bhadrakāras and Paṭaccaras as one of the tribes who fled westwards from fear of Jarāsandha, king of Magadha. Accordingly there is no need whatever to attempt to remove the Bodhas from this passage in favour of the Yaudheyas.

(3) Kuśalya / Kirāta. The crux here is far more complicated than in either of the two preceding cases, and the consequent uncertainty is reflected in the fact that each purāṇic list gives a different reading, i. e. Bḍ. (Followed by Kirfel) Kuśalya ; Mt. (followed by Sircar) Kirāta ; Mk. Aśvakūṭa ; Vā. Kisaṣṇa / Kisaṣṭa ; Br. Mukuṭa ; Vām. omits. Even greater variations are found in the corresponding section of the Mahābhārata geographical list where the editor of the Poona Critical Edition has adopted the reading Sukaṭya. Variants include Sukuṭṭa, Sakuṭṭa, Sunkanta, Kucanḍa, Kucāṭṭa, Kucattā, Kucadlya and Kucalya. Neither Kirfel's nor Sircar's text appears satisfactory. The Kāśyapa-saṁhitā (25. 9.) has a reading Kauśalya which is very similar to Kirfel's, but locates it in the East between Tāmralipta and Kaliṅga. Moreover what is precisely to be understood by Kuśalya is far from clear. At first sight it would appear to have some connection with Kośala, but this name is actually mentioned at the end of the same line. Kuśalya therefore seems a somewhat dubious reading. Sircar's variant, Kirāta, is at least free from obscurity, for this tribe is one of the best known of Ancient India. The difficulty in this case arises from its location in the Central Division. The usual location of this tribe is on the North-Eastern frontiers of India and Nepal, where its name is clearly preserved by the modern Kirantis. Its location in Madhyadeśa however is extremely improbable, and is most likely to be the result of a copyist's effort to "correct" the text by changing a name unknown to him into a well known one without considering its geographical position at all.

Fortunately evidence supplied by the Vaijayantī (p. 38. §1. 40) and the Jain geographical lists collated by Kirfel (Die Kosmographie der Inder p. 227) seems to provide a solution of the problem. The Vaijayantī mentions a tribal name, Kuṣaṭa, and locates it in Madhya-deśa, while the Jain texts refer to a country called Kuśārtha or Kuṣaṭṭha whose capital was called Saurika or Seripura. The close similarity in form between Jain Kuśārtha or Kuṣaṭṭha, Vaijayantī Kuṣaṭa, and the variants

found in certain manuscripts copies of the geographical catalogue of the Mahābhārata Kucāṭṭa Kucāṭṭa indicates that the original reading was possibly Kucāṭṭa. The Jain texts do not unfortunately specify the direction in which this tribe is to be located, but its association with Kāśī, Kośala, Kuru, Pāñcala and Jaṅgala is a clear indication that it must belong to Madhya-deśa, an hypothesis which is supported by the Vaijayanṭī and Mahābhārata passages.

(4) Kuntala / Kuntī. The difficulty in establishing the correct text here is of a completely different nature to the preceding one. In this case the problem is not to determine the form of the name but to decide which of two well known names is the more probable reading, a point which can only be solved by reference to their location. The evidence for a tribe of Kuntalas in Madhya-deśa is very doubtful. Pargiter (Mārkp. trans. p. 308) following Cunningham, locates them at Kuntala near Chanour to the south of Banaras, an identification accepted by S. B. Chaudhuri in his recent study "Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India" (p. 59). Such an identification however only rests on similarity of form between the ancient and modern name and must therefore be disregarded. The evidence of both literary texts and epigraphy prove that the Kuntalas occupied the modern Kanarese speaking districts of Mysore. The Kuntis on the other hand are definitely located by a passage of the Mahābhārata on the banks of the Aśvanadī river, a tributary of the Carmanvatī (mod. Chambal) and have accordingly been identified with Kontwar in Gwalior State by Agrawala. (M. B. Vanap. ch. 303. India as known to Pāṇini. p. 66). Such a position would enable them to be included within Madhya-deśa. Moreover the Garuḍa-purāṇa (55.12.) also locates them in the Central Division. While in the geographical section of the Mahābhārata and Padma-purāṇa both Kuntala and Kuntī are found. Accordingly Sircar's reading may be accepted.

(5) Atharva / Avanta. Neither Kirfel's nor Sircar's text seem satisfactory. The authenticity of the Atharvas cannot

be established from any independent text and so the form is likely to be the result of textual corruption. Sircar connects the Āvantas with the Avantis, who lived in West Malwa and had their capital at Ujjain. The latter are however mentioned later on in the Bhuvanakośa lists as a Vindhya people (e.g. Mārkp. 57. 55). Unless therefore we are to assume an "overlapping" of the Central and Vindhyan division, a thing for which there is no evidence, Avanti must be regarded as out of place in the present context. Once again considerable help in restoring a more plausible name than Atharva or Āvanta is supplied by the Vaijayanṭi which mentions, a form Pr̥thava (p. 38. śl. 4). This may be connected with the Pr̥thūdaka (mod. Pehoa) of Rājasekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, which specifies it as the boundary separating Madhya-deśa from Uttarāpatha. The Vāyu-purāṇa from Arthapa, would also suggest that a 'p' formed part of the original name.

(6) Kaliṅga / Bhuliṅga. Sircar's choice of Bhuliṅga is very attractive. Bhuliṅga can certainly be placed within Madhya-deśa, as both the Kāśikā\* commentary on Pāṇini IV. 1. 173 and the Vaijayanṭi (p. 38. śl. 39) refer to it as a member of the Śālvas' confederacy so that no difficulty arises with regard to its location within Madhya-deśa. A difficulty however does arise from the fact that, as the Śālvas, have just been mentioned in the text, there appears to be no logical reason for singling out one of the members of the confederacy and repeating it. On the other hand a similar anomaly is found in the *Kārmavibhāga* texts (BS. XIV. 2-4) where, while the Śālvas are again located in the Central Division, the Audumbaras, who according to the Kāśikā and the Vaijayanṭi are also a branch of the Śālvas, are again separately mentioned. Similarly in the

---

5. Kāśikā on Pāṇini IV. 1. 173.

Udumbaras Tilakhalā Madrakāra Yugandharāḥ  
Bhuliṅgaḥ Śāradandās ca saṭ Śālvāvayavā ime

The Vaijayanṭi's text is slightly corrupt.

Śālvas tu Kārakutsalyās tesāṃ tv avayavāḥ pare  
Udumbaras Tilakhalā Mahākāra Yugandharāḥ  
Huliṅgaḥ Śāradandās ca saṭ Śālvāvayavā ime

Mahābhārata, the Śālvās and Yugandhāras are both mentioned. Accordingly though there is a degree of tautology involved in accepting the reading Bhuliṅga, the evidence of other texts shows that this cannot be regarded as a serious objection for its inclusion in the text. On the other hand Kirfel's choice of Kaliṅga presents considerable difficulty because there is no evidence for assuming that this important tribe lived at any time within the limits of Madhya-deśa. Though there is considerable divergence of opinion over the exact area they occupied, literary and epigraphic sources agree in placing them in Orissa.

(7) Vṛka/Andhaka. The weight of the evidence of the purāṇic lists is preponderately in favour of Vṛka, for only the Matsya-purāṇa reads Andhaka. Vṛka may be connected with the Vṛkasthala of the Mahābhārata (V. 84. 1.) which locates it a short distance to the south of Hastināpura.

(8) Though both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading *Magadha*, its inclusion in Madhya-deśa is by no means free from difficulties, as this well-known kingdom is also located in the later on in these Bhuvana-kośa lists (e.g. Mārkp. 57.44.) and also by the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā (G.O.S. p. 93) which specifies Banaras as the boundary between Madhya-deśa and Pūrva-deśa. As Magadha is to be identified with the Patna and Gaya districts of Bihar to the East of Banaras, it is difficult to understand how it can be included in Madhya-deśa. Moreover the reading Magadha is only to be found in the Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu-purāṇas. Kirfel himself was evidently not altogether satisfied with its accuracy at the time of writing his earlier study, Bhāratavarṣa, and adds a footnote<sup>6</sup> that perhaps the reading Malaja (i.e. mod Shāhabad District, west of the Sone) should be adopted. B.C. Law (A.B.O.R.I 1936 p. 217ff.) also rejected Magadha and has been followed quite recently by S. B. Chaudhuri who makes the original suggestion that the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa variant, Malaka, is a slight corruption of

---

6. p. 58, n. 92. Vielleicht ist hier Malaja zu lesen; diese bewohnten den Distrikt Shāhabād, westlich des Flusses Sone.

Mulaka, a people who are frequently associated with the well known Āśmakas Chaudhuri's hypothesis however depends on the location of the Āśmakas in Madhya-deśa for which he cites the evidence of the Kūrma-vibhāga text of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa (58. 7.). A comparison of this text with the parallel passages of the Bṛhatsaṃhitā and Parāśara shows that Āśmaka is a variant for Āśvattha. The authenticity of the form Āśvattha is confirmed by the gaṇapāṭha of Pāṇini IV. 2. 80. n. 5. Āśmaka on the other hand is a well known name but cannot be included in Madhya-deśa, as elsewhere they are located in the North-West (BS. XIV.22) or in the South (Mārkp. 57.48.) where they may be identified with the region around Paithan on the north bank of the Godāvarī. Accordingly Mulaka cannot be accepted as reading here for the same reasons as Magadha.

The results of our investigation of the lists of Madhya-deśa tribes now being completed, we may tabulate our results in the form of a new text. All *underlined names* will denote new readings different from those of Kirfel and Sircar; a *dotted underlining* will show where a choice has been made between the two. This procedure will also be continued throughout this article with regard to the other geographical divisions with the result that a new text will be established.

tāsv ime Kuru-Pāñcālāḥ Śālva Mādreya-Jāṅgalāḥ

.....

Śarasenā Bhadrakārā Bodhāḥ saha-Pataccarāḥ

.....

Matsyāḥ Kuṣaṭṭhāḥ Kuljās ca Kuntayāḥ Kāśī-Kośalāḥ

.....

Prthavaś ca Bhulīṅgās ca. Magadhās ca Vṛkaiḥ saha

... ..

Madhyadeśyā janapadāḥ prāyaśo 'mi prakīrtitāḥ

It now remains to identify briefly the above mentioned names and so establish that they can be located within Madhya-deśa :

(1) Kuru. mod. Thaneswar between the Sarsuti and Chitang rivers. Capitals Hāstinapura in Meerut District and Indraprastha. (mod. Indrapat near Delhi.)

(2) Pāñcāla. mod. Bareilly and Farrukhābād Districts.



Capitals Abichattrā (mod. Ramnagar) and Kāmpilya (mod. Kampil).

(3) Śālva. mod. Jaipur and Alwar according to Cunningham (A. R. A. S. I. XX. p. 120). Pargiter (Mārkp. trans. p. 349) and McCrindle (Ptolemy p. 163) would locate them on the west side of the Aravalli Hills.

(4) Mādreya. Possibly the territory adjoining the Śālvās where the descendants of one of the sons of Mādri, i. e. Sahadeva or Nakula, set up a small independent kingdom.

(5) Jāṅgala. This territory, also known as Kuru-Jāṅgala, may be identified with the wooded districts to the east of Kurukṣetra between the Ganges and Uttara-Pāñcāla.

(6). Śurasena. They are the Surasenoi of Arrian, and may be located in the mod. Mathura District. Their capital, Mathurā, may be identified with Maholi, five miles to the south-west of the modern town of Mathura. Their territory therefore lay to the south of the Kuru country and to the Matsyās.

(7) Bhadrakāra. Their identity is uncertain. Most scholars<sup>7</sup> would connect them with the Madrakāras, a branch of the Śālvās. This however is by no means certain, for the evidence of the Kūrma-vibhāga<sup>8</sup> text of the Br̥hatsamhitā clearly implies that the Bhadrās and Madras were two separate tribes. Accordingly the Bhadrakāras are more likely to be connected with the Bhadrās rather than the Madras, and the Kūrma-vibhāga text does actually mention a group of Bhadrās as living in Madhya-deśa, with which the Bhadrakāras may well be identical. Some support for this view is also supplied by the Pariśiṣṭa to the Atharva-Veda, which refers to a people called the Bhadrakas in association with the Godhas (i. e. corrupt for Bodha), Madhya-deśa and the Kurus (L. 2, 4.) It therefore appears highly probable that the Bhadrakāras of the Purāṇas,

---

7 e. g. Agrawala. India as known to Pāṇini. p. 57; Przyluski. J. A. 1929. p. 7.; Sircar. IHQ. XXI. p. 300. For opposite view see Chaudhuri. Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India. Part. 1. p. 23.

8. Bhadra. BS. XIV. 2 (in Madhya deśa); XIV. 7 (in East); XIV. 18 (in South). Madra. BS. XIV. 22. (in North); XIV. 27 (in North-West).

the Bhadrakas of the *Parīśiṣṭa*, and the Bhadras of the *Br̥hatsamhitā* XIV. 2 are identical. Modern Bhadra, situated on the Ghaggar near the north-east border of Bikaner may mark the site of their original home.

(8) Bodha. mod. East Punjab north of Indarpat.

(9) Paṭaccara. mod. Allahabad and Banda Districts.

(10) Matsya. mod. Alwar and Jaipur. Capital Vairāṅgana (Mod. Bairat 100 miles S-W of Delhi and 40 miles N of Jaipur).

(11) Kusatta. Location uncertain.

(12) Kulya. Possibly the Kol<sup>9</sup> of Muslim historians. i.e. mod. Aligarh and Bareilly Districts.

(13) Kunti. According to the evidence of *Mahābhārata* 3.292.25 the Kuntis must be located to the south of Mathurā on the bank of the *Aśvanadī*, a tributary of the *Carmanvatī* (mod. Chambal).

(14) Kāśī. mod. Banaras District. Kāśī was properly the name of the country of which *Vāīāpasī* (Banaras City) was the capital.

(15) Kośala This Kośala is Uttara-Kośala with its capital at Ayodhyā on the Sarayū. mod. Oudh.

(16) Pṛthu. The Pṛthus may be regarded as the inhabitants of Pṛthūdaka. i. e. mod. Pehoa in the Karnal District of the Punjab.

(17) Bhuliṅga. Ptolemy refers to them as Bolingai (VII. 1.69), but wrongly locates them east of the Vindhya. According to Pliny (N. H. VI. 20) they may be placed to the north-west of the Aravallis.

(18) ? Magadha. As stated, the text is very uncertain here. Magadha must be identified with Patna and Gaya Districts of Bihar.

(19) Vṛka. This tribe is mentioned by Pāṇini (V. 3. 115) as a sangha. Agrawala<sup>10</sup> connects it with the Varkana of the

9. Ohaudhri. p. 58-59.

10. Agrawal. p. 484. Behistan Law of Darius col. II. 1. 16.

Behistun Inscription of Darius and locates it in Hyrcania, but such an identification is untenable if the Vṛkas of Pāṇini are the same as those of the Purāṇas, as is very likely. A more probable place for their location is Vṛkasthala, which is only a short distance south of Hastināpura according to the Mahābhārata (V. 84. 1.). Chaudhuri<sup>11</sup> would connect them with the Varikas mentioned in the Bijayagarh (Near Byana in Bharatpur State) inscription of Viṣṇu-vardhana dated 372 A. D., and so locate them in Bharatpur.

#### UTTARĀPATHA.

##### Kirfel's Text.

Bāhlikā Vāṭadhānās ca Ābhiraḥ Kalatoyakāḥ  
 Aparāntās ca Śūdrās ca Pallavās Carmakhaṇḍikāḥ  
 Gāndhārā Yavanās caiva Sindhu-Sauvira-Madrakāḥ  
 Śakā Drubāḥ Kulindās ca Pāradā Hāramūrtikāḥ  
 Ramaṭhāḥ Kaṇṭakārās ca Kekayā Daśamālikāḥ  
 Kṣatriyopaniveśās ca vaiśyaśūdrakulāni ca  
 Kāmbojā Daradās caiva Barbarā Aṅgalaukikāḥ  
 Cīnās caiva Tuṣārās ca Pahlavā Bāhyatodarāḥ  
 Ātreyaś ca Bharadvājāḥ Prasthalās ca Daserakāḥ  
 Lampākās Talagānās ca Sainikāḥ saha Jāṅgalaiḥ  
 Apagās cĀlimadrās ca Kirātānam ca jātayah  
 Tomarā Haṁsamārgās ca Kāśmirās Taṅgaṇās tathā  
 Calikās Cābukās caiva Haṇa-Darvās tathaiva ca  
 ete deśā udīcyās tu,

##### Sircar's Text.

Vāhlikā Vāṭadhānās ca Ābhiraḥ Kalatoyakāḥ  
 Aparāntās ca (Pārāntās caiva ?) Śu-(Kṣu-?) drāśca  
 Pahlavās Carmakhaṇḍikāḥ  
 Gāndhārā Yavanās caiva Sindhu-Sauvira-Madrakāḥ  
 Śatadrujāḥ Kuṇindās ca Pāradā Hārahūpakā  
 Ramaṭhāḥ Kaṇṭakārās ca Kaikeyā Daśamānakāḥ  
 Kṣatriyopaniveśās ca tathā śūdrakulāni ca  
 Kāmbojā Daradās caiva Varvarā Aṅgalaukikāḥ  
 Cīnās caiva Tuṣārās ca bahulā bāhyato nariḥ

11. Chaudhuri p. 80. OII. III. 263.

Kṣatrayoṭha Bharadvājāḥ Prasthalās ca Daserakāḥ  
 Lampākās Tala-(ś cĀva-?) gānās ca Cūlikā Jāguḍaiḥ saha  
 Aupadhā (Aurasā ?)-ś CĀnibhadraś ca Kirātānām ca  
 jātayaḥ  
 Tomarā Haṁsamārgās ca Kāśmīrās Taṅgaṇās tathā  
 Kulūtās Cāhu-(Bāhi-?)kāś caiva Ūṛṇā (Hūṇa ?) Darvās  
 tathaiva ca  
 ete deśā udīcyās tu

An analysis of the above texts show the following variations :

- (1) K. Bāhlika. S. Vāhlika ; (2) K. Aparānta. S. ? Parānta ;  
 (3) K. Śūdra. S. ? Kṣudra ; (4). K. Pallava. S. Pahlava ;  
 (5) K. Śaka, Druha. S. Śatadruja ; (6) K. Kulinda. S. Kuṇinda  
 (7) K. Hāramūrtika. S. Hārahūṇaka ; (8) K. Kekaya ; S. Kaikeya ;  
 (9) K. Daśamālika ; S. Daśamānaka ; (10) K. vaiśya. S. tathā ;  
 (11) K. Barbara. S. Varvara ; (12) K. Pahlava. S. bahula ; (13)  
 K. Bahyatodara. S. bāhyato narāḥ ; (14) K. Ātreya. S. Kṣatra-  
 yotha ; (15) K. Talagāṇa. S. ? Avagāṇa ; (16) K. Sainika. S.  
 Calika ; (17) K. Jāṅgala. S. Jāguḍa ; (18) K. Apaga. S. Aupadha  
 (? Aurasā) ; (19) K. Alimadra. S. Anibhadra ; (20) K. Calika. S.  
 Kulūta ; (21) K. Cāhuka. S. ? Bāhika ; (22) K. Hūṇa.  
 S. Ūṛṇa. (Hūṇa).

Of these nos. 1, 6, 8, 11, are merely recognised variants of the same name and accordingly do not require further discussion.

(2) Aparānta ? Parānta. It is very difficult to understand how Aparānta (i. e. the inhabitants of the Western Region) can be the correct reading here in a list of Northern tribes. The Vaijayanti (p. 37 śl. 35.) specifically locates it in the West (Aparāntās tu pāścātyās), while Bhaṭṭasvāmī, the commentator on Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (II. 1, 2, 4.) identifies it with the Konkan. Sircar without giving any reason suggests that Parānta is the correct reading, while Kirfel identifies Aparānta with the Western seaboard of India. Chaudhuri (Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India, pp. 55-6.) after citing considerable evidence in support of the accepted identification of Aparānta with the Konkan, then somewhat arbitrarily decides that the Aparānta of the Junāgadh record (c. 150 A. D.) had a different application

representing a portion of Upper Sindh with portions of North Rajputana". It is difficult however even to consider this area as lying within the limits of Uttarāpatha. An attractive solution to the problem is to be found in the variant Aparita which is included in the text of the Brahmāṇḍa - and - Vāyupurāṇas. This name may be associated with the Apritas of Pāṇini (IV.2.53. Gaṇa) and the Aparytai of Herodotus (III. 91) who has transcribed it almost perfectly. It may accordingly be identified with the modern Afridi tribe of N. W. F. P. It is not without significance that Afridi is still locally pronounced as Apridi. Aparānta can therefore be dismissed as a copyist's "correction" of the text by changing a less well known name to a well known one without any regard for its geographical location.

(3) Śūdra/ ?Kṣudra. Sircar's attempt to substitute Kṣudra i. e. Greek Oxydrakoi is unnecessary. The Śūdras were known to the Greeks as Sodrai. They are mentioned in association with the Ābhīras in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (I. 2. 3.) and the Mahābhārata, a passage<sup>12</sup> of which specifically locates these two peoples in the Northern Division where the Sarasvatī (mod. Sursooti) disappears.

(4) Pallava/Pahlava. Pahlava (Parthia) is certainly the correct reading. The Pallavas are always referred to as a southern people and are first known from epigraphic evidence in the third century A. D. By the end of the sixth century A. D. they had achieved a considerable importance there.

(5) Śaka, Druha/Śatadruja. Kirfel in his earlier<sup>13</sup> study of this passage had originally adopted the reading Śatadravāḥ. His later text presents no difficulty as far as the Śakas are concerned, but neither the Druhas nor the Vāyupurāṇa variant,

12. MB. (Gita Press ed) IX. 37. I. Śadrābhīrān prati dveṣād yatra naṣṭī Sarasvatī. This evidence is confirmed by another passage of the Mahābhārata.

Śadrābhīragāṇas caiva ye caśritya Sarasvatīm  
vartayanti ca ye matayair ye ca parvatavāsinaḥ

MB. (Poona ed.) 2. 20.9

13. Bhāratavarsha. p. 44.

Hrāda, are known elsewhere. Accordingly Śatadruja. i. e. the people of the Sutlej valley, is a much more attractive reading. The Śatadru is mentioned as a river of Uttarāpatha both by Rājasekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṃsā (G. O. S. p. 93) and the Pariśiṣṭa to the Atharvaveda (LVI. 9). The difficulty in adopting this reading however is that it necessarily compels the elimination of Śaka from the Uttarāpatha list where one would naturally expect it to be included. On the other hand it is not difficult to imagine that a careless copyist might have corrupted Śatadruja into Śatā (which a later copyist might have "corrected" into Śaka) and Drujā i. e. the Druha of the Brahma-purāṇa.

(7) Hāramūrtika/Hārahūṇaka. Sircar's choice of Hārahūṇaka has much to recommend it, as the geographical catalogue of the Mahābhārata associates them with the Rāmaṭhas (6. 10. 55). Rājasekhara in his Kāvya-mīmāṃsā (G. O. S. p. 93) similarly locates the Hārahaura (i. e. Hārahūṇas) in Uttarāpatha. Kirfel's reading, Hāramūrtika, is slightly different from that found in his earlier study where the form Hāramūṣika was adopted. As the authenticity of neither of these forms can be corroborated from any independent source, they may be rejected as corruptions.

(9) Daśamālika/Daśamānika. The accuracy of Kirfel's form, Daśamālika, is confirmed by the geographical section of the Mahābhārata (MB. 6. 10. 65). These Daśamālikas are possibly identical with the Dāsamīyas mentioned elsewhere in the Great Epic (MB. 2. 47.5 ; 8. 30.36 ; 8. 51.16.) and the Dāsameyas of the Bṛhat-saṃhitā (XVI. 28) who are likewise located in the North.

(10) Vaiśya/Tathā. Sircar's omission of vaiśya seems quite unnecessary. One would naturally expect the vaiśyas to be mentioned along with the other two castes of Hindu society. Moreover the weight of textual evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of vaiśya, as only the Vāmana-purāṇa omits them. Similarly in the geographical text of the Mahābhārata (MB. 6. 10. 65.) all manuscripts consulted by the Editors of the

Poona Critical Edition read *vaiśya*, the only variant being whether it should be part of a compound or Nominative Plural.

(12) *Pahlava/bahula* The difficulty involved in reading *Pahlava* is that this name has already been adopted at an earlier place in this text (see. sec. 4.) Kirfel by choosing *Pallava* in the first instance is accordingly able to read *Pahlava* here. As stated previously the *Pallavas* cannot possibly be located in the Northern Division and the theory that they had originally some connection with the *Pahlavas* has now finally been disproved. The variant '*bahula*' overcomes this difficulty of a double mention of *Pahlava* and gives quite a good sense when considered in regard to the other names of the śloka. It is evident that the list is now passing through the outer limits of *Bhārata-varṣa* into Central Asia; firstly we find a reference to the *Kāmbojas* and *Daradas* of the Hindu Kush region, then to the *Cīnas* and *Tuṣāras*, who must have lived somewhere to the North of that region, and finally to the *bahulā bāhyato narāḥ* i. e. the populous tribes who lived outside the limits of *Bhārata-varṣa*.

(13) *Bāhyatodara / bāhyato narāḥ*. The text here depends entirely on what has been adopted as the preceding word. If *bahula* i. e. populous, is read, inevitably the following part of the *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* text must be adopted. Chaudhuri<sup>14</sup> conjectures that *Bāhyatodara* is possibly corrupt for an original like *Vihāra-dvāra* and may be connected with *Bukhara*, but this seems a very doubtful suggestion.

(14) *Ātreya/Kṣatrayoṭha*. Kirfel's reading is clearly correct as the *Ātreyas* are mentioned along with the *Bharadvājas* in the geographical section of the *Mahābhārata* (MB. 6.10.67.) and also in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini (IV. 1.110. gaṇa). As two independent sources prove the close association existing between the *Ātreyas* and *Bharadvājas*, there is no need for Sircar's emendation to *Kṣatrayoṭha*.

(15) Talagāna/? Avagāna. Sircar's suggestion that Avagāna is the original reading is quite unnecessary as the authenticity of the form Talagāna is proved by the shorter Karmavibhāga text of the Garuḍa and Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa (Gḍ 55. 19; Vdh. 1. 9. 9), both of which refer to a tribe called the Tāla or Tālanāgas, in the Northern Division in close association with the Lampakas. Nāga may easily be explained as a metathesis of gāna. The same confusion between the forms Talagāna and Talanāga is found in editions of the Matsya-purāṇa, that of the Bāṅgabāī Office, Calcutta, adopting the latter, while other printed editions prefer the former.

(16) Sainika/Cūlika. Cūlika is the most probable reading. The Karma-vibhāga texts locate them in the North-West (BS. XIV. 23) and the accuracy of this location is confirmed by the Matsya-purāṇa which states that the Vakṣu (Oxus) flowed through their territory. (Mt. 121. 45). Neither Sainika nor any of the variants listed in the other purāṇas occur elsewhere.

(17) Jāṅgala/Jāguḍa. Jāṅgala is a most improbable reading as it has already been located in the Central Region. The accuracy of Sircar's choice of Jāguḍa is confirmed by a passage of the Mahā-bhārata, (MB. 3. 48. 21) where the Jāguḍas are mentioned in association with the Hāra-hūnas, Cīnas, Tuṣāras, Saindhavas, Ramaṭhas etc. According to the Matsya-purāṇa (121. 46) the Indus flowed through their territory.

(18) Apaga/Aupadha (? Auiasa). The corresponding passage of the geographical text of the Mahā-bhārata (6. 10. 67) lists the variants Aupaka, Opaga and Aupaga. Of these forms the most plausible reconstruction is probably Aupaga.

(19) Alimadria/Anibhadra. The constant confusion that arises between m and bh owing to their great similarity in the Devanāgarī character has been mentioned earlier in this article. Dey (Geog. Dict. p. 4) would identify the Alimadras with the inhabitants of Hoti-Mardan to the north-east of Peshawar.

(20) Cūlika/Kulata. The difficulty in reading Cūlika in this context is that this name has already been selected in section



16. Kirfel however has escaped this obstacle by adopting Sainika in the latter passage, and so he is free to read Calika here. Sircar's suggestion of Kulūta has much to recommend it, as this tribe is frequently located in the North by passages in the Mahā-bhārata (e. g. MB. 6, 10, 52; 2. 24. 4. etc.) and Rājaśekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṃsā (G.O.S. p. 93). The Bṛhat-samhitā refers to two branches, one in the North-West and the other in the North-East (BS. 14. 22 and 29).

(21) Cāhuka/ ? Bāhika. Sircar's suggestion that Cāhuka should be emended to Bāhika (i. e. the Panjab) seems very arbitrary and not required by the context. The parallel passages of the Brahma and Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇas list the form Kuhaka, while Rājaśekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṃsā refers to a Northern people called the Hūhukas. The Matsya-purāṇa (121. 46) says that the Indus flowed through the janapadas of Gāndhāra, Urasa, and Kuhu. It is obvious that all these forms are variants of the same name. A comparison suggests that the original form may have been Kuhuka, i. e. the inhabitants of the territory adjoining the Kuhū (mod. Kabul) river.

(22) Hūṇa/Ūṇa (? Hūṇa). The reading Hūṇa is almost certainly correct as one would not expect a tribe of its importance to be omitted from any geographical list.

The results of our investigation of the lists of Udīcya peoples now being completed, we may tabulate the results in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names will denote new readings different from those of Kirfel and Sircar, while a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between the two.

Bāhlikā Vāṭadbhānās ca Ābhīrah Kālatoyakāḥ  
Apailās ca Sūdrās ca Pahlavās Carmakhaṇḍikāḥ  
 .....

Gāndhārā Yavanās caiva Sindhu-Sauvīra-Madrakāḥ  
 Śatadrujāḥ Kulindās ca Pārada Hārahūṇakāḥ  
 .....

Ramathāḥ Kaṇṭakārās ca Kekayā Daśamālikāḥ  
 Kṣatriyopaniveśās ca vaiśyaśūdrakulāni ca  
 .....

Kāmbajā Daradās caiva Barbarā Aṅgalaukikāḥ

Cīnās caiva Tuṣāṇās ca bahulā bāhyato narāḥ  
 .....  
 Ātreyaś ca Bharadvājaḥ Prasthalās ca Daserakāḥ  
 .....  
 Lampākās Talagāuās ca Śūlikā Jāguḍaiḥ saha  
 .....  
 Aupagā Alimadīś ca Kīātānām ca jātayaḥ  
 .....  
 Tomarā Harṁsamārgās ca Kāśmīrās Taṅgaṇās tathā  
 Kulūtaḥ Kuhukās caiva Hūṇā Darvās tathaiva ca  
 .....  
 ete deśā udīcyās tu.

It now remains to locate the above tribes and so confirm their position in Uttarāpatha.

(1) Bāhlika. Most scholars locate this well known tribe originally in the modern region of Balkh on the northern frontier of Afghanistan. From this region they are said to have migrated later to the Panjab where they lived generally between the Sutlej and the Indus, but more particularly in the areas west of the Rāvi and the Āpagā. It should be remembered however that there is no evidence for assuming that the Bāhlikas originally migrated from Balkh, and the references to them throughout Sanskrit literature, the oldest of which appears to be that of the Atharva-veda (5. 22. 5-9), imply that they were an Indian and not an Iranian tribe. Furthermore the Old Persian Inscriptions of Darius, which must refer to a period some centuries later than the Atharva-veda, mention Balkh as Baxtri which the Greeks correctly transcribe as Baktia. The migration theory accordingly seems somewhat doubtful.

(2) Vāṭadhāna. Passages in the Mahābhārata agree in locating them in the North West. (MB. 2. 29. 7 ; 6. 10. 45. etc.). Their exact location is uncertain. Pargiter (Mārkp. trans. p. 313.) places them on the east bank of the Sutlej to the south of Perozepur, while Dey (Geog. Dict. p. 27) locates them at Bhatnair.

(3) Abhira. They are frequently associated with the Śatāpa, and are to be located in West Rajputana where the river Śatpavati (mol. Sursooti) disappears (MB. Gītā Press. IX. 31. 1 ; Śmṛāhīrān prati deśād yatra naśā Sarasvatī.). Dey wrongly

identifies this Sarasvatī with the Western Sarasvatī and so erroneously locates them in Gujarat.

(4) Kālatoyaka. Paigiter would identify this with the Delta of the Indus.

(5) Aparīta. The modern Afridi tribe of N. W. F. P.

(6) Śūdra. They are the Soudai of the Greeks and the Sudraki of Pliny (Nat. Hist. 6. 20.) Their location in West Rajputana where the Sarasvatī disappears has already been established by the passage quoted above in regard to the Ābhīras.

(7) Pahlava. The Parthians.

(8) Carnakhaṇḍika. Possibly the inhabitants of Samarkhand.

(9) Gāndhāra. This was a janapada of considerable antiquity being known from Vedic times. (RV. 1. 126. 7.). The Greeks knew it as Gandaridai (Ptol. 7. 1. 44) or Gandarites (Strabo. XV. 1. 25). It is to be located in the modern Rawalpindi and Peshawar districts. Its capitals were Puṣkalāvati (mod. Chersaddah) to the west of the Indus and Takṣaśilā (mod. Taxila) to the east of the same river.

(10) Yavana. The Indo-Greek settlements in the North-West of India.

(11) Sindhu-Sauvīra. Sindhu clearly refers to some part of the Indus region, and at the time of Hiuen Tsang was evidently restricted to the upper part of this territory. (Watters. on Yuan Chwang. II. pp. 252-3.). The location of Sauvīra has however been a matter of some controversy. Cunningham (A. G. I. 1924 ed. p. 57) identified it with Eder, a district of Gujarat, but such a location is too far south. Alberuni (ed. Sachau. I. p. 259-60, 300.) identifies it with Multan and Juhrawar districts below the junction of the Jhelum and the Chenab. According to Buddhist texts its capital was Roruva (mod. Rori in Upper Sind.).

(12) Maḍraka. The district between the Chenab and Ravi rivers. Capital Sākala (mod. Sialkot).

(13) Śataḍruja. The people of the Sutlej valley.

(14) Kulinda. The Kulindine of Ptolemy (VII. 1. 42), who locates them in the mountainous region where the Sutlej, Jumna and Ganges have their sources. They are considered to have inhabited the southern slopes of the Himalayas eastward from the Kulu valley to Nepal. Large numbers of their coins have also been found in the Saharanpur and Ambala Districts north of Delhi.

(15) Pārada. The Paradene of Ptolemy (VI. 21. 4.) who locates them in Gedrosia. They are very probably of Iranian origin. Most scholars consider them identical with the Pahlavas (i. e. Parthians), but an objection to this view is that the Pahlavas have already been mentioned in this passage. Similarly in the geographical text of the Mahāmāyūrī J. A. 1915. p. 112, line 65.) both Pahlava and Pārata (i. e. Pārada) occur in the following sequence : Kāpīśi-Pārata-Śakasthāna-Pahlava. If the two names were synonyms one would not expect both to be mentioned in such close juxtaposition.

(16) Hāra-Hūna. The "White Huns". In the Mahābhārata they are classed as an "outside" people, but by the time of Kālidāsa (*Raghuvamśa*. IV. 68) they had established a kingdom in the Oxus valley. The Brhatsaṃhitā (XIV. 33.) makes them the most important tribe of the North-West division in the sixth century A. D. and the accuracy of this information is strikingly confirmed by the early Christian writer, Kosmas Indikopleustes<sup>15</sup> (circa. 535 A. D.) who says that the empire of the White Huns extended to the Indus.

(17) Ramaṭha. A low and barbarous tribe according to the Mahābhārata (12. 65. 14.). They were probably closely associated with the Hāra-Hūnas, as in addition to the evidence of the present text they are also connected with the same tribe in the Dig-vijaya of Nakula. (MB. 2. 29. 11.). They are perhaps identical with the Rhamnai of Ptolemy. Lēvi<sup>16</sup>

15. McCrindle *Anc. India*. vol. VI. p. 165 ; For a detailed study of the Hāra-Hūnas see Bailey 'Hārahūna Asiatica' (*Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, 1954),

16. J. A. 1915, p. 112 ; MB. 3. 48. 21. Mahāmāyūrī, line 99.

would locate them near Ghazni on the evidence of the Mahābhārata and Mahā-māyūrī.

(18) Kaṇṭhakāra. They are probably identical with the Kaṇṭhadhānas of the Bṛhatsaṃhitā, who are also located in the North (BS. XIV. 26.). Chaudhuri (*Ethnic Settlements*, p. 99.) conjectures that they may have been the inhabitants of modern Kandahar.

19. Kekaya. Mod. Jhelum and Shahpur Districts of the Punjab. Capital Rājagṛha or Girivāja (mod. Girjak or Jalalpur on the Jhelum river).

20. Daśamālika. Nothing is known of this tribe except that, as already mentioned, it may be identical with the Dāsamiyas of the Mahābhārata or the Dāsameyas of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts which likewise locate it in the North.

21. Kāmboja. Though Kāmboja<sup>17</sup> was a janapada of considerable importance and antiquity being mentioned in the Nirukta of Yāska (II. 2.), its exact location is still uncertain and has been the subject of much controversy. Much of this has been caused by the inability of scholars<sup>18</sup> until recently to realise that there are two countries called Kāmboja. This is specifically shown by a passage of the Mahābhārata (2. 24. 22-4.) which states that Arjuna after conquering the Daradas and Kāmbojas proceeded North and next after defeating the robber tribes, subjugated the Lohas, the Parama-Kāmbojas and the Uttara-ṛṣikas. The mention of the Daradas in the present text shows that the more southerly branch of Kāmbojas are

17. Agrawal (*India as known to Pāṇini*, p. 49) would connect Kāmboja with Old Persian Kambujiya. This is clearly wrong as the latter is a proper name, Cambyses; of, the Behistan Inscription of Darius, I, 28

18. Upādhyāya (*India in Kalidasa*, p. 59.) who locates correctly the Kāmbojas of the Raghuvamś in the Gāloha-speaking territory of the Yarkand Valley but fails to realise that this branch is the Parama-Kāmbojas, not the branch of Kāmbojas associated with the Daradas.

MB. 2. 24. 22-4. Daradān saba Kāmbojair ajayat pākāśāsaniḥ  
prāguttarāṇi dīśān ye ca vasanty āśritya dasyavaḥ  
nivasanti vane ye ca tūn sarvān ajayat prabhuḥ  
Loban Parama-Kāmbojan Ṛṣikān uttarān api  
sahitān tūn mahārāja vyajayat pākāśāsaniḥ

being referred to in this context. Nevertheless there is still considerable difference as to the region they occupied. As the purpose of this article is primarily to determine the correct text however, it will be sufficient to state the two most important opinions among modern scholars on the location of Kāmboja.

According to Ray Chaudhuri (*L'Iconographie Bouddhique*, p. 134), who relies on the evidence of the Kaiṇa-paiva (MB. 7.4.4.), Rājapura (mod. Rajaori S-E of Punch) is contiguous to Kāmboja. He accordingly locates it in the present Chitral and Hazara districts. This view is however refuted by Jayacandra Vidyālakṣmīkara (*Bhārata-bhūmi aur uske nivāsi*, pp. 297-305), who points out that these regions were occupied by the Uragas and Abhisāras. He then proceeds to identify Kāmboja in modern Kafiristan on the evidence of the Rājatarāṅginī,<sup>19</sup> which states that Lalitāditya of Kashmir (595-732 A. D.) on entering the northern district defeated the Kāmbojas, while the Tuṣāras fled; he then marched against the Bhauttas and Daradas. The location of the former in Baltistan and Bolar is certain and so Kāmboja must accordingly be placed in Kafiristan.

(22) Darada. The Daradrai of Ptolemy (VII. 1. 42), who locates them near the source of the Indus. Mod. Dardistan, north of Kashmir.

(23) Barbara. Sircar would connect this name with the Barbaricon emporium at the mouth of the Indus delta which is mentioned by the anonymous author of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea. (*Periplus* p. 38). Ptolemy (VII. 1.59) also mentions a town of Barbarei on an island formed by the same river, and Majumdar in his revised edition of McCrindle's Ptolemy (p. 370) identifies the Barabara of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas with these Barbarei. This however seems a dubious conjecture as the Barbaras of the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas are always mentioned in association with Himalayan tribes like the Kirātas,

19. *Raj.* IV. 163ff. vide also J. U. P. H. S. Dec. 1943, *Geographical Studies in the Mahābhārata*, p. 38ff, I. H. Q. XXVI (1950) p. 123. Hapa, Yavans, Kambojas.

Daradas and Śakas. It accordingly seems preferable to assume that the term Barbara in Sanskrit Literature refers to the wild tribes of the Himalayas.

24. Aṅgalaukika. Perhaps the Agalassians of Alexander's historians (Diodorus. 17. xcvi.); if so, they are to be located below the junction of the Jhelum and the Chenab. It is more probable however that they are identical with the Aṅgalokyas of the Matsya-purāṇa (121. 44.) through whose territory the Sitā (Jaxartes) is said to flow.

25. Cina. They are usually identified with the Tibeto-Chinese tribes who lived on the northern slopes of the Himalayas, though attempts have been made to connect them with the Shinas of the Upper Indus Valley.

26. Tuṣāra. The Tukhāristān of the Arabs which included old Bactria and the mountainous country on both sides of the middle Oxus as far as Badakhshan.

27. Ātreya. and 28. Bhāradvāja. Both these gotras of brahmins are referred to by Pāṇini in his gaṇapāṭha to IV. 1.110. Pargiter (Mārkp. (trans.) p. 320.) has located them in Garhwal on the evidence of the Mahā-bhārata (MB. 3. 26.6-8; 3.135. 9f.), which places them in Dvāita-vana.<sup>20</sup> This may be identified with an area not far from the Himalayas which was bounded by the Taṅgaṇas on the North-East and Kurukṣetra and Hastināpura on the South-East.

29. Prasthala. Mod. Patiala District. Law (Geog. Dict. p. 117.) erroneously connects it with the Patala of Greek writers, and so locates it in the Indus Delta. The extremely close association of Prasthala and Trigarta in both the Mahā-bhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa indicate that the Prasthalas were a Panjab people.

30. Daśeraka. The three lexicographers, Yādava-prakāśa, Hemacandra, and Puruṣottamadeva agree in identifying the Daśerakas with the inhabitants of Maru, i. e. mod Marwar.

31. *Lampaka*. The *Lambatai* of Ptolemy (VII. 1.42.), who locates them near the sources of the *Koa* (*Kabul*) river. Their name is preserved in modern *Lamghan*, a small territory on the northern bank of the *Kabul* river.

32. *Talagāna*. The close association of this people with the *Lampakas* not only in the present texts but also in the geographical sections of the *Garuḍa-purāṇa* (55. 19.) and the *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa* (1. 9. 9.) prove that they must be located somewhere near *Lamghan*.

33. *Śūlika*. According to the *Matsya-purāṇa* (121. 45.) the *Oxus* flowed through their territory.

34. *Jāguḍa*. "The Saffron country". mod. *Ghazni* district of South Afghanistan from which large quantities of *asafoetida* are exported. The name *Jāguḍa* survives in modern *Jaghuri* to the south of *Ghazni* in the *Kandahar*.

35. *Apaga*. Dey would identify this with *Kāmboja*, but this appears very doubtful as the latter have already been mentioned in the present list and hence there would be little point in repeating it through a synonym. Shafer suggests that they may be a tribe of *Kirātas*, but again there is no evidence for this. Sircar<sup>21</sup> considers it to be a corruption of an original *Aurasa* (mod. *Hazara District*), while S. P. Chaudhuri, who prefers the variant *Apaga*, thinks that the correct reading should be *Avagāṇa* (*Afghans*).

36. *Alimadra*. Mod. *Maidan District* to the north of the *Kabul* river in the *Yusufzai* subdivision of *Peshawar District*.

37. *Kirāta*. The *Kirihadai* of the Greeks. This well-known and<sup>22</sup> powerful tribe occupied the Himalayan regions of *Nepal* and *Assam*. Their name is preserved by the modern *Kiranti* tribe.

21. *Ethnography of Ancient India*. p. 121.

22. A great point of controversy among scholars is whether the *Kirātas* were originally an Eastern tribe, who extended westwards, or whether they were originally a North-Western people, who spread eastwards finally settling in the extreme North-Eastern corner of India. For a detailed analysis see *Bonow* in *Le Monde Oriental*, 1936, vol. 80, p. 90 ff.



38. Tomara. The inhabitants of the mod. Garo Hills region in the south-western corner of Assam.

39. Haṁsamārga. Possibly modern Hunza and Nagar Districts (J. U. P. H. S. XVII. Pt. 1. (1944) p. 48.). It is an interesting example of how the name of a place, "the route of the geese" became that of a people.

40. Kāśmīra. Kashmir.

41. Taṅgaṇa. According to McCrindle<sup>23</sup>, the Ganganoi of Ptolemy is a corruption of Tanganoi. They are accordingly to be located in the region extending from the Rāmagaṅgā river to the sources of the Upper Sarayū.

42. Kulūta. The Kulu valley of modern Kangra District. Numismatic evidence indicates that they were the neighbours of the Kuṇindas.

43. Kuhuka. The inhabitants of the banks of the Kabul river.

44. Hūṇa. Though well known in the Epics and Purāṇas as a "frontier" tribe, no specific position can be assigned them until the time of Kālidāsa, who locates them on the Oxus. By the middle of the sixth century A. D. they had established a considerable empire in the North-West extending to the Indus. Their power was subsequently destroyed by Yaśodharman.

45. Dāva. This tribe is frequently associated with the Abhisāras and may be located along with them in the Punch-Naoshera regions between the Jhelum and the Chenab.

#### PURVA-DEŚA

##### Kirfel's Text.

Angā Vaṅgā Madgurakā Antargiri-Bahirgirāḥ  
tataḥ Plavaṅgā Vaṅgeyā Māladā Mālavartikāḥ  
Suhmottarāḥ Pravijayā Bhārgavā Geyamālavāḥ  
Prāgjyotiṣāś ca Puṇḍrāś ca Videhās Tāmraliptakāḥ  
Mālā Magadha-Gonardāḥ prācyā janapadāḥ smṛtāḥ

---

23. McCrindle, Ptolemy p. 241 on Ptolemy VII, 2. 13.

**Sircar's Text.**

Āṅgā Vaṅgā Mudgarakā Antargiri-Bahirgiri  
 rathā Pravaṅga-Vāṅgeyā Maladā Mallavarttakāḥ  
 Brahmottarā Pīa (Śrī ?)-vijayā Bhāṅga-Vāṅgeya-Mallakāḥ  
 Prāgjyotiṣāś ca Pauṇḍiāś ca Videhās Tāmraliptakāḥ  
 Mallā Magadha-Gonardāḥ piācyā janapadāḥ smṛtāḥ

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations.

- (1) K. Madguraka. S. Mudgaraka; (2) K. Bahirgiāḥ. S. Bahirgiri; (3) K. Plavaṅga. S. Pravaṅga; (4) K. Vaṅgeya. S. Vāṅgeya; (5) K. Mālada. S. Malada; (6) K. Mālavartika. S. Mallavarttika; (7) K. Suhmottara. S. Brahmottara; (8) K. Pravijaya. S. ? Śīvijaya; (9) K. Bhāṅgavā Geyamālava. S. Bhāṅga-Vāṅgeya-Mallaka; (10) K. Pauṇḍia. S. Pauṇḍia; (11) K. Māla. S. Malla.

of these nos. 5, 6, 10 and 11 are obvious variants of the same name and accordingly do not require further discussion. In the case of no. 2. both agree on the name Bahirgiri, K making it Nominative Plural, while S prefers to link it with Antargiri in a dual compound.

(2) Madguraka/Mudgaraka. Sircar's reading is definitely the correct form as both the *Vaijayantī* and the *Kāvya mīmāṃsā* list it as Mudgaraka and Mudgara respectively.

(3) Plavaṅga/Pravaṅga. The second reading seems preferable and evidently refers to a tribe who are before the Vaṅgas. Pargiter (*Mārkp. (trans)* p. 325) identifies it with the Āṅgas, but they have already been mentioned if we take the *Matsya-purāṇa* text of this passage as most likely to represent the original one. The Pravaṅgas are probably identical with the Upavaṅgas of the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*. These cannot possibly be equated with the Āṅgas, for the latter are mentioned only two names after the Upavaṅgas (BS. XIV. 8. Vaṅga-Upavaṅga Jaṭhara-Āṅga etc.).

(4) Vāṅgeya/Vāṅgeya. Though both Kirfel and Sircar agree in including Vāṅgeya in their texts, its inclusion in a

passage where both the *Vaṅgas* and *Pravaṅgas* have already occurred seems to add nothing to the sense. An extremely interesting variant is found however in the *Ānandāśrama* Press edition of the *Matsya-purāṇa* which instead of *Vaṅgeya* reads *Mātaṅga*, a name that has so far been completely disregarded by scholars, but which appears to be a much better alternative. Its location in the Eastern Division is proved by the testimony of the *Kāśyapa Samhitā* (25. 9.), while it is also mentioned in the *Bṛhatsamhitā*, the *Yukti-kalpa-taru*, and the *Ratna-parikṣā*, of *Budha-bhaṭṭa* as a place famous for its diamonds. Thus no objection can be made to *Mātaṅga* on the ground of location.

(7) *Submottara*/*Brahmottara* The correct reading here is supplied by the geographical text of the *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā*, which corresponds so closely in form to the purāṇic texts that it may be reasonably assumed that its author utilised one or more of them as his source. Most scholars assumed the question whether *Submottara* or *Brahmottara* is the correct reading. Those favouring the former defend their choice by stressing the importance of the *Suhmas*, while those adopting the latter reading refer to its mention in the *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* and the *Nāṭya śāstra*, where *Brahmottara* is included in a list of Eastern peoples. It is also mentioned in the purāṇa list of rivers as one of the countries through which the Ganges flows. Accordingly this evidence is conclusive in establishing the existence of the *Brahmottaras* with the result that many scholars<sup>24</sup> at once reject *Submottara*. This however is only partially correct, for *Rāja-śekhara*'s list shows that the original text was *Suhma-Brahmottara*. *Brahma* in the text of the *Matsya-purāṇa* somehow became displaced and so the false form '*Submottara*' arose. Accordingly both *Suhma* and *Brahmottara* should be included in the text.

(8) *Pravijaya*/ ? *Śrīvijaya*. Sircar's suggestion of *Śrīvijaya* which he connects with mod. Palembang in Sumatra is ex

24. B8. LXXX. 7. ; *Yuktikalpataru*. p. 96. ; *Ratna-parikṣā* I <sup>12</sup>

25. Pargiter *Mārkp.* (trans) p. 387 ; I.H.Q. III (1922) p. 521f

mely fanciful. It is clear from the context that only tribes within the boundaries of Bhāṭata-varṣa are being listed. Praviṣaya, which Dey (without citation of evidence) identifies with Jyntea in Assam, is also a very doubtful form and probably owes its existence to textual corruption as the evidence of both the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā and the Nāṭya-śāstra shows, for both these texts at this point read *prabhṛtayaḥ* "etc." The parallel of the Mahābhārata reads *Prāvṛṣeya* "people in whose country there is a long rainy season."

Compare :

Purāṇic.	Brahmottarāḥ <i>Praviṣayā</i> Bhārgavāḥ
Mahā-bhārata (6.10.49.).	Mahyuttarāḥ <i>Prāvṛṣeyā</i> Bhārgavāḥ
Kāvya-mīmāṃsā (p. 93.).	Suhma-Brahmottara- <i>prabhṛtayaḥ</i>
Nāṭya-śāstra (13. 33.).	Brahmottarāḥ <i>prabhṛtayo</i> Bhārgavāḥ

If we adopt the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā text, we become involved in a scansion difficulty, as the first half of the śloka would have too many syllables. This however can be overcome by substituting for *prabhṛtayaḥ* its synonym *ādyāś ca*. The final form of the first half of the line will accordingly be *Suhmā Brahmottarādyāś ca*.

(9) Bhārgavāḥ Geyamālavāḥ / Bhārga-Vaṅgeya-Mallakāḥ. It will be evident that the crux of the problem here is whether we are to read two names with Kirfel or three with Sircar. In the latter case it is difficult to understand whether Sircar wishes his text to be divided as above or alternatively as Bhārgava-Aṅgeya. The cause of the confusion is due to some doubt as to whether the first name is to be read as Bhārgava or Bhārga ; if we adopt the latter alternative, vā must necessarily form the first syllable of the following name and so vāgeya at once suggests Vaṅgeya. Our first consideration must be therefore to establish the form of the first name as Bhārgava or Bhārga. Unfortunately however to make the position more complex, both names occur in the geographical catalogue of the Mahābhārata in what appears to be a list of eastern peoples, viz. Mahyuttara, Prāvṛṣeya, *Bhārgava*, Puṇḍra, *Bhārgas*, Kirāta,

*etc.* In addition, the Bhārgavas are mentioned by the Nāṭya-śāstra (13. 33.) in a group of Eastern peoples, while the Bhārgas are mentioned in a sūtra of Pāṇini (IV. 1. 178.) Thus both names are definitely established by two independent sources other than the geographical catalogue of the Mahābhārata. The question of which of them is the more probable reading in the passage under discussion can therefore only be determined by location. The Bhārgas are obviously connected with the Bhaggas of Pāli texts,<sup>26</sup> according to which they were a dependency of the Vatsas. The Vatsas are definitely to be located around their capital, Kauśāmbī (mod. Kosam, west of Allahabad). Accordingly they would normally be classed as a tribe of Madhya-deśa, so that it is probable that the Bhārgas were also members of the same division. Bhārgava is therefore the better reading as the Nāṭya-śāstra specifically places it in the East. In addition it automatically removes Vaṅgeya as a member of the list which considerably simplifies the position, for there is no need for such a name when the Vaṅgas and the Pravaṅgas have already been mentioned.

Bhārgava therefore is clearly the first member of the second half of this śloka; it now remains to determine the second part. There is considerable difference however between the names in Kirfel's and Sircar's texts, the former reading Geyamālava and the latter Vaṅgeya or Aṅgeya and Mallaka. None of the names in any of the Purāṇic lists occur elsewhere so that the probability arises that they are all corruptions. It would seem likely though that Geya should be emended to Gaya, i. e. the inhabitants of the city of Gaya, who are mentioned in the Mahābhārata (2. 48. 15.) among a group of eastern peoples who paid tribute. The only outstanding question now is to determine the final name for which we have two alternatives, Mālava and Mallaka. Of these two choices the Mālavas are a very well known people, but they are always located in either the Northern or the Vindhyan division and so

26. Ang. II. 61; Vin. II. 127, IV. 115 See also Kirfel's lists in *Die Kosmographie der Indier*, p. 227.

cannot possibly be considered in the present context. Mallaka on the other hand would be a possible reading, did the same name not occur in the next śloka. As there can hardly be room for two tribes of the same name in a comparatively short list of this nature, it would also appear a doubtful reading. One possible solution suggests itself. If we take m as an orthographical error for bh, a confusion that repeatedly occurs in Sanskrit due to the considerable similarity of these two letters in the Devanāgarī script, a form *Bhallaka* is obtained. This can at once be equated with the Bhallas of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts, who are located in the North-East. Similarly a country called Bhallāṭa is mentioned in the eastern digvijaya of Bhīmasena<sup>27</sup>. The evidence of these two independent sources thus definitely establish the existence of a country called Bhalla or Bhallāṭa in the eastern division. Accordingly it seems preferable to replace Mallaka by Bhallaka, so that the second half of this line may be restored as *Bhārgavā Gaya-Bhallakāḥ*.

The results of our investigation of the lists of Eastern peoples now being completed, we may tabulate our results in the form of a new text. As before, all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sircar's texts.

Aṅgā Vaṅgā Muḍgarakā Antargiri-Bahirgiriāḥ  
.....

tathā Pravaṅgā Mātaṅgā Maladā Mallavarttakāḥ

Suhmā Brahmottarādyās ca Bhārgavā Gaya-Bhallakāḥ

Prāgyotiṣās ca Puṇḍrās ca Videhās Tāmraliptakāḥ

Mallā Magadhā Gonardāḥ prācyā janapadāḥ smṛtāḥ

It now remains to identify each of the above mentioned tribes briefly and so confirm their location in the Eastern division.

(1) Aṅga. mod. Bhagalpur district. Capital Campā, two miles west of Bhagalpur.

(2) Vaṅga. In Epic and Purāṇic texts the Vaṅgas occupied only the eastern section of Bengal towards the Ganges

---

27. BS. XIV. 30; MB. 2. 27. 5. (Poona Critical Edition reads *Opakṛta*.)

delta. Pargiter (J.A.S.B. 1897 p. 85) accordingly located them in the areas of Murshidabad, Nadia, Jessore, and parts of Rajshahi and Faridpur. Later they greatly extended their territory and their name came to denote the whole province of Bengal.

(3) Mudgaraka. mod. Monghyr in Bihar.

(4) Antargiri and (5) Bahirgiri. In another passage of the Mahā-bhārata (6.10.48) these two names are associated with the Aṅgas and Maladas. Accordingly they may be identified with the people living within, and on the outskirts of the Rajmahal Hills.

(5) Pravaṅga. They are probably the same as the Upavaṅgas of the Bṛhat-saṁhitā and may be located in the central portion of the eastern part of the Ganges delta.

(6) Mātāṅga. Reference has been made to its location by the Kāśyapa-saṁhitā in the Eastern division to the north of Tamruk. The Bṛhatsaṁhitā (LXXX 7.) says that it is famous for its diamonds, evidence which is confirmed by the Yuktikalpa-taru (p. 96). Dey would locate it to the south-east of Assam.

(7) Malada. mod. Maldah. Another tribe of the same name is later mentioned in these texts as living in the Vindhya near the Kārūṣas.

(8) Mallavarttika. Probably the inhabitants of the Mallapavata or Pārsvanātha Hills, namely the area now forming the districts of Hazaribagh and Manbhum in the states of Bihar and Orissa.

(9) Suhma. mod. Howrah and Midnapore districts of West Bengal.

(10) Brahmottara. Its position within the Eastern division is uncertain, though by its close association with Suhma, one might normally expect it to be located somewhere to the north of the Midnapore district. Sircar's identification of Brahmottara with Burma is unsupported by any evidence and is

decisively rejected by the *Matsya-purāṇa* (121.50) which states that the Ganges flowed through the territory of the Magadhas (mod. Bihar), the Aṅgas (mod. Bhagalpur dist.), the Brahmo-ttaras, the Vaṅgas (mod. Murshidabad dist.) and the Tāmraliptas (mod. Tamluk). According to this evidence the Brahmo-ttaras must be located on the Ganges between Bhagalpur and Murshidabad.

11. Bhāṅgaya. The general consensus of opinion of modern scholars is to identify the Bhāṅgavas with the Bhais of western Assam. Such a location however would be more suitable for the Bhallas, as will be shown very shortly in paragraph 13 of this section. Shafei<sup>28</sup> would locate them in the southern part of U. P. on the strength of being a brahmin line which served at Ayodhyā and Kānyakubja and their having conquered the Tālajaṅghas. Such a position would make them a tribe of Madhya-deśa rather than of Pūrva-deśa.

12. Gaya. This reading, if correct, would of course refer to the inhabitants of Gayā on the Phalgu river which flowed through the city. At the time of Hiuan-tsang's<sup>29</sup> visit in A.D. 637, it was a flourishing city "well defended, difficult of access and occupied by a thousand families of brahmins, all descendants of a single ṛṣi".

13. Bhallaka. The digvijaya section of the *Mahā-bhārata* establishes its location on the side of the Śuktimān (Kuksimān) mountain, which must be a peak of the Himalayan range. The *Bṛhatsamhitā* also locates the Bhallas in the North-East. Ptolemy refers to them as *Darrhai*. They may accordingly be identified with the Bhara who now occupy the mountainous areas of Western Assam.

14. Prāḡjyotiṣa. Mod. Gauhati Dist. of Assam and the region of the Brahmaputra valley. According to the lexicographers, the Prāḡjyotiṣas were identical with the Kāmarūpas. Prāḡjyotiṣa was also the name of a city, possibly the capital, of

28. E.A.I. p. 69; 27 Watters on Yuan Chuang II. pp. 110 ff; 18 BS. XIV. 30, Ptol. VII. 2, 20.

29. Ptol. VII. 1. 73, Nat. Hist. VI. 20,



Kāmarūpa according to a passage in the Kālikā-purāṇa, (38. 155), which runs thus: *Prāgyjyotiṣam puram gatvā Kāmarūpāntara-sthitam*.

15. Puṇḍra. mod. North Bengal. Capital Puṇḍra-var-dhana (Mod. Mahasthan, seven miles north of Bogra).

16. Videha. mod. Tirhut Dist. of North Bihar, Capital Mithilā (mod. Janakpur in the Nepalese Tarai).

17. Tāmraliptaka. mod. Tāmluk in Midnapur Dist. about 12 miles from the junction of the Rupnarayan with the Hooghly. It is identical with the Tamalites of Ptolemy and the Taluctae of Pliny.

18. Malla. According to Buddhist sources the Mallas are to be located in the districts of Kuśāvati at the junction of the Gaṇḍak with the Little Rāpti or near Kasiā and Pavā (mod. Padraona, 12 miles N-E of Kasiā or Fāzilpur 10 miles S-E of the same place.).

19. Magadha. mod. Patna and Gayā Dists. of Bihar. Capitals Girivraja (mod. Rajgir) and Pāṭaliputra (mod. Patna), which in the annals of classical writers is referred to as Palibothra.

20. Gonarda. Both Chaudhuri and Sircar are inclined to doubt the inclusion of Gonarda in the Eastern Region. A decisive fact in establishing its location in this division however is the evidence of the Kāśikā commentary on Pāṇini's Aṣṭā-dhāyī. I. I. 75. *En Prācām deśe* "A word that has e and o as the first among its vowels gets the designation of Vṛddha when it is the name of *Eastern* countries". Among examples of these Gonarda is quoted. Gonarda may be identified with Gonda in Oudh, the birthplace of Patañjali.

(To be Continued)

## THE FOUR-FOLD DIVISION OF THE HEAVENLY RIVER IN THE PURĀṆAS

DR. B. H. KAPADIA

*Sardar Vallabhbhai Vidyapeeth*

[ देवतया गङ्गाया उद्गमस्थानं पुराणेषु सोमाख्यः कश्चिद्  
आकाशाम्भोनिधिः कथ्यते । गङ्गावतरणं रामायणे महाभारते पुराणेषु  
च वर्ण्यते । रात्रौ दिवि दृश्यमानश्छायापथ एव दिव्या त्रिपथगा इति  
वायुपुराणे प्रोक्तम् । आकाशादवतीर्य शिवशिरसि घृताया गङ्गाया  
बिन्दुभिश्च क्षितौ बिन्दुसरो निर्मितमित्यपि पुराणेषु कथितम् । रामायणे  
गङ्गायाः सप्तधा स्रोतस्मु विभागो वर्णितः, पुराणेषु तु प्रायेण गङ्गाया-  
श्चत्वारि स्रोतांसि—सीता-अलकनन्दा-बक्षु-भद्रसीमा—इति नामभिः  
प्रोक्तानि । महाभारते च त्रीन् लोकान् पावयन्ती त्रिपथगा,—इत्यादि  
गङ्गाया वर्णनं प्राप्यते—इत्यादयो विषया लेखनेनात्र निबन्धे विचारिताः ।]

The investigation of the relation of Soma with the waters has given out that even the Vedic Indians had thought of the Heavenly river or the rivers as the exodus of the Heavenly Soma-ocean existing in the highest heaven. The Purāṇas<sup>1</sup> also know the Heavenly river as the defluxion of the Soma ocean.

In the 47th Adhyāya of the Vāyu Purāṇa is described the descent of the Gaṅgā. The opening (vv. 22-27) exactly agrees with the M.Bh. 6.6.42-47. The line तत्र दिव्या सप्तधा प्रतिपद्यत of M. Bh. 6.6. 47 occurs here again with the variant सोमपादप्रसृता सा “coming out from the rays of the moon.” Here it is the 3rd pāda of v. 26. It is followed by a pair of verses which gives us interest : The path of light (the milky way) in the heaven which one sees illuminated at night along the belt of the circle of constellations is the godly purifying river flowing in three paths. Purifying mid-air and the heaven coming down on the earth when she fell on the head of Śiva, she was held back through the magic of yoga. The lake Bindusaras arose on the earth from the few drops that fell off from the enraged

one. Therefore it is called the Bindusaras (the lake of the drops).<sup>3</sup>

Then it is narrated in the Rāmāyaṇa I. 43 (partly verbally borrowed from the Epic), how Śiva restrained the Gaṅgā, which believed to carry forth the god in her torrential sweep to the nether world down below, and was restrained by way of punishment for her haughtiness. Śiva did this till he was moved at the sight of Bhagīratha who implored him to release her. As in the Rāmāyaṇa, here she does not give rise to the Bindusaras in the first instance although it is referred to in v. 26 and after it in v. 41 but here is described at once the seven fold division again somewhat resembling the Rāmāyaṇa<sup>3</sup> and at the conclusion of it countries are mentioned in detail, the countries through which the seven streams flow through.

A quite different description of the descent of the heavenly river, which is absolutely incongruous with the one that is given above, occurs in many other Purāṇas<sup>4</sup> and is already given before in the 42nd Adhyāya verses 1 ff<sup>5</sup>:—

‘These divine rivers with holy waters have flown out from excellent lakes and rivers with large mass of water. Listen to these in due order. From that heavenly ocean possessing the name of Soma, the support of all beings, the container of nectar of gods, from which started the river full of holy water, flows in the air with her clear water, flows in the seventh path of the wind. The mighty elephant of the Great Indra wandering in the path of the mid-air and sporting in the interior agitates the water. Speedily going round the mountain Meru from the right to the left, she flows to the extent of 84 Yojanas.<sup>6</sup> During which her water is split asunder by the furious wind. She fell on the four highest pinnacles of the mountain Meru. Then recoiling on the highest slope of the highest peak of Meru has her water scattered up and herself is divided into four parts. She then makes to fall the 60000 yojanas of the sky devoid of support in the four directions from Meru. The auspicious, the beautiful,

the great river, fell round the four great slopes of the mountain Mandara (i.e. Meru) etc.\*

In the following verses is described exactly the path of each of the four rivers from the spur of the mountain Meru, to the four lakes and the thickets encircling Meru and through a phantastic series of mountains till the junction of Sītā in the Eastern, Alakanandā in the Southern, Vakṣu<sup>7</sup> in the Western and Bhadrasomā in the Northern ocean.

In the place of the sevenfold division, thus here is described the fourfold division of the heavenly river. However, the common origin of the four great heavenly rivers in which Gaṅgā divides is the heavenly ocean, which has the name Soma, i.e. not other than that ocean in the highest heaven which we know as the home of Soma. Indeed, it was only so very near that time, which had become foreign to the description of the heavenly Soma-ocean and thus understood Soma here as the Moon. Thus, e. g. Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa 56. I. ff makes Gaṅgā to originate from the foot of Nārāyaṇa, and then first enters the Moon and from there fell on the mountain Meru.<sup>8</sup> Thereby the Moon is designated as Soma and is provided with adjectives सुधायोनि and आषार अम्भसा<sup>9</sup> thus the ancient description once more glimmers through Viṣṇupurāṇa (II, 2. 31) and Kūma P. (46. 28) but it is simply said : After coming out from the foot of Viṣṇu she flooded over the orb of the Moon.<sup>9</sup>

The fourfold division of the heavenly river is likewise unknown to the epics as the sevenfold division to the numerous Purāṇas. A combination of both however occurs in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (56.7-12),<sup>10</sup> Viṣṇu Purāṇa (II-2.34)<sup>11</sup> and Agni Purāṇa (108.20).<sup>12</sup> Like the usual Purāṇas they describe the fourfold division and add to this the account about the course of the southerly stream with the sevenfold division.

That the Ganga came out from the feet of the Lord is known even to Kālidāsa. In Kumārasambhava 6.70 he writes :-

यथैव श्लाघ्यते गङ्गा पादेन परमेष्ठिनः ।

In one of the inscriptions<sup>13</sup> of Samudragupta of about 350 A. D., there is reference to Gaṅgā being entangled in the matted hair of Śiva

To take a review of the above discussion, we find that, the story of the Gaṅgāvatarana of the Rāmāyaṇa agrees somewhat with Vāyu P. In Harivaṃśa (3. 17. 22-25) the words of Vāyu (लोमपादप्रसूता सा) is differently worded. The story of Gaṅgā coming from the foot of Vāmana must have been set rolling by the Vaiṣṇavas. Harivaṃśa, the oldest literary record of the Vaiṣṇavas, has not got this. But the Sabhā Parvan of the M. Bh. 47. 22 and Viṣṇu P. has got this account. In Viṣṇu P. (4. 4. 15) Gaṅgā is described as coming from the lotus like feet of Viṣṇu. Bāṇa and Kālidāsa make use of this, Rāmāyaṇa has this legend in detail. Vāyu has not the legend in such a great detail (Ad. 47). Vāyu P. 32-33 and Rāmāyaṇa Bāla-Kāṇḍa Adh. 43 8-9 are almost identical. On comparison, we find, that the description about the descent of the Gaṅgā was in vogue from antiquity. Vāyu and Rāmāyaṇa may have made use of the third source. The story of Hariv. as compared to Vāyu and Rāmāyaṇa appears to be modern. It may be as old as 4th cent. A. D. as it is used by Kālidāsa. Jambūdvīpaprājñapti, a work on Jaina Cosmology, divided into seven sections makes a reference to the Gaṅgā.

The sacred river Ganga is very well known as *tripathagā*. In accordance with the account of the M. Bh. 109, the heavenly Gaṅgā as she was made to fall down on the earth, divided not in seven but in three paths. In V. 10 it is stated: "Spreading about in different directions she became of three paths as she was going to the ocean." According to this threefold division the Gaṅgā is generally called as one going in three paths.<sup>14</sup> She possesses this name even there where she is specially called the Heavenly river.<sup>15</sup> For the explanation of this expression, it is said in the Rāmāyaṇa I. 44. 6. "She is called tripathagā because she purifies the three paths."<sup>16</sup> Other passages give scope for no doubt that the three paths go through the three worlds. M. Bh. I. 96. 19 mentions Gaṅgā as Trilokagā. In the Gaṅgāvatāra of

the M. Bh. 13. 26 73 it is said that the three worlds are embellished through the pure three paths.<sup>17</sup> M. Bh. 13. 26. 89 states that the Gaṅgā lends purity to the three worlds.<sup>18</sup> V. 28 therefore calls her trilokagoptrī.<sup>19</sup> It is quite possible that the composer of the Mahābhārata considered the three worlds as the heaven, the mid-region and the earth. It is said in v. 79 : "the great and the small beings, who are found in the heaven, in the mid-region and on the earth should always take bath in it."<sup>20</sup> In v. 87 it is stated that once her fame was filled in the air, in the heaven, on the earth, the main directions and in the intermediary directions.<sup>21</sup> M. Bh. I. 170. 21ff notes : "Of one shore, pure, flowing in heaven, with the gods this Gaṅgā appears as Alakanandā, O gandharva. Likewise, this Gaṅgā when she is desired by the Pitr̥s is known as Vaitaraṇī, difficult to be crossed by the sinful ones. Thus is said by Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana."<sup>22</sup> Thus, according to M. Bh. 3. 109. 10 there is a reference to the threefold division of her. The ashes of the Sagarides, for the purification of which she is called, is in the netherworld. Therefore her three courses are : "one is in the heaven, one is on the earth and one is in the netherworld"

Incidentally it may be mentioned that the legend about the descent of the Gaṅgā is referred to in the concluding Maṅgala of Brh. Vāttika (VI. 5. 22.) but in a sense quite different from Naiṣkarmya siddhi, IV. 76.

#### Footnotes

1. A similar abridged account with variants occurs in Brahmanḍa Purāṇa 18. 25 ff, Matsya-purāṇa 120. 23 ff

2. Vāyu Purāṇa 47. 28-30 —

दिवि छायापथो यस्तु अनुक्षत्रमण्डलम् ।

इश्यते भास्वरो रात्रौ देवी त्रिपथगा तु सा ॥ २८ ॥

अन्तरिक्षं दिवं चैव भावयन्ती भुवं गता ।

भवोत्तमाङ्गे पतिता संमूहा योगमायया ॥ २९ ॥

तस्या ये बिन्दवः केचित् क्रुद्धायाः पतिता क्षितौ ।

कृतं तु तैर्बिन्दुसरस्ततो बिन्दुसरः स्मृतम् ॥ ३० ॥

3. Rāmāyana vv. 37-41 :—

ततो विसर्ज्यमानायाः स्रोतस्तत् सप्ततां गतम् ।

तिस्रः प्राचीमभिमुखं प्रतीचीं तिस्र एव तु ॥ ३७ ॥

नद्याः स्रोतस्तु गंगायाः प्रत्यपद्यत सप्तधा ।  
 नलिनी ह्लादिनी चैव पावनी चैव प्राग् गताः ॥ ३८ ॥  
 सीता चक्षुश्च सिन्धुश्च प्रतीचीं दिशमाश्रिताः ।  
 सप्तमी त्वन्वगात् तासां दक्षिणेन भगीरथम् ॥ ३९ ॥  
 तस्मात् भगीरथी या सा प्रविष्टा लवणोदधिम् ।  
 सप्तैता भावयन्तीह हिमाल्क्षं वर्षमेव तु ॥ ४० ॥  
 प्रसूताः सप्त नद्यस्ताः शुभा किन्दुसरोद्भवाः ।  
 नानादेशान् भावयन्ति स्लेच्छप्रायांश्च सर्वशः ॥ ४१ ॥

4. *Līṅga-purāṇa* 52, 1-10, *Kūrma-purāṇa* 46, 28 33 :—

5. cf. सरोवरेभ्यः पुण्योदा देवनद्यो विनिर्गताः ।  
 महौषतोया नद्यश्च ताः शृणुष्वं यथाक्रमम् ॥ १ ॥  
 आकाशाम्भोनिधिर्योऽसौ सोम हृत्यभिधीयते ।  
 आधारः सर्वभूतानां देवानाममृताकरः ॥ २ ॥  
 तस्मात्प्रवृत्ता पुण्योदा नदी ह्लाकाशगामिनी ।  
 सप्तमेनानिलपथा प्रयाता विमलोदका ॥ ३ ॥  
 [ सा ज्योतीष्यनुवर्तन्ती ज्योतिर्गणनिषेविता ।  
 ताराकोटिसहस्राणां नक्षत्रैश्च समायुता ॥ ] ॥ ४ ॥  
 माहृद्रेण गजेन्द्रेण आकाशपथयायिना ।  
 क्रीडता ह्यन्तरतले या सा विक्षोभितोदका ॥ ५ ॥  
 [ नैकैर्विमानसंघातैः प्रकाशयद्भिन्नभस्तलम् ।  
 सिद्धैरुपस्पृष्टजला महापुण्यजला शिवा ॥ ६ ॥  
 वायुना प्रेर्यमाणा हि चानेकाभोगगामिनी ।  
 परिवर्तयत्यहरहो यथा सूर्यस्तथैव सा ] ॥ ७ ॥  
 चरवार्यशीति प्रतता योजनाना समन्ततः ।  
 वेगेन कुर्वती मेरुं सा प्रयाता प्रदक्षिणम् ॥ ८ ॥  
 विभिद्यमानसलिला तैजसेनानिलेन च ।  
 मेरोरन्तरकूटेषु पतिताथ चतुर्ष्वपि ॥ ९ ॥  
 मेरुकूटतटान्तेभ्य उत्कृष्टेभ्यो निर्वतिता ।  
 विकीर्यमाणसलिला चतुर्धा संस्तोदका ॥ १० ॥  
 षष्टियोजनसाहस्रं निरालम्बनमम्बरम् ।  
 निपपात महाभागा मेरोस्तस्य चतुर्दिशम् ॥ ११ ॥  
 सा चतुर्ष्वभिर्तश्चैव महापादेषु शोभना ।  
 पुण्या मन्दरपूर्वेषु पतिता हि महानदी ॥ १२ ॥

6. *Linga-purāṇa* 52. 6 ff. has instead :—

चत्वार्यशीतिश्च तथा सहस्राणां समुच्छ्रितः ।  
 योजनानां महामेरोः श्रीकण्ठाक्रीडकोमलः ॥  
 तमासीनो यतः सर्वः साम्बः सह गणेश्वरैः ।  
 क्रीडते सुचिरं कालं तस्मात् पुरयजला शिवा ॥  
 गिरि मेहं नदी पुण्या प्रयाति हि प्रदक्षिणम् ॥

7. i. e. the *Oxus*. *Vijaya P.* does not give the name, other *Purāṇas* mostly give the reading *Oakus* or the like.

8. cf ततः द्रवृता या देवी गंगा त्रिपथगामिनी ।  
 सा प्रविश्य सुघायोनि सोममाधारमम्भसाय ॥  
 ततः सम्बध्यमानार्करस्मिंसंगतिपावनी ।  
 पपात मेरुशृङ्गे च सा चतुर्धा ततो ययौ ॥

- 9 ( विष्णुपादविनिष्क्रान्ता ज्ञावयित्वेन्दुमण्डलम् । )

likewise *Bhāg. P. V. 17. 4* : इन्दुमण्डलमावार्य ; Agni  
*P. 148. 10* : ज्ञावयित्वा चन्द्रम्

10. *Mārkaṇḍeya P. 56. 7 ff.*—

तथैवालकनन्दाख्या दक्षिणे गन्धमादने ॥ ७ ॥  
 मेरुपादवनं गत्वा तन्दनं देवनन्दनम् ।  
 मानसं च महावेगात् ज्ञावयित्वा सरोवरम् ॥ ८ ॥  
 आसाद्य शैलराजानं रम्यं हि शिखरं तथा ।  
 तस्माच्च पर्वतान् सर्वान् दक्षिणोपक्रमोदितान् ॥ ९ ॥  
 तान् ज्ञावयित्वा सम्प्राप्ता हिमवन्तं महागिरिम् ।  
 दधार तत्र तां शम्भुनं मुमोच वृषध्वजः ॥ १० ॥  
 भगीरथेनोपवासेः स्तुत्या चाराधितो विभुः ।  
 तत्र मुक्ता च सर्वेण सप्तधा दक्षिणोदधिम् ॥ ११ ॥  
 प्रविवेश त्रिधा प्राच्यां ज्ञावयन्ती महानदी ।  
 भगीरथरयस्थानु स्रोतसेकेन दक्षिणाम् ॥ १२ ॥

- (11) *Viṣṇu P. II. 2. 84* :

तथैवालकनन्दापि दक्षिणेनैव भारतम् ।  
 प्रयाति सागरं भूत्वा सप्तभेदा महासुने ॥ ३४ ॥

- (12) *Agni P. 108. 20*, where however the stanza ends :

कुत्वा सप्तभेदाय पश्चिमम् ॥ अन्धि च चक्षुः.....

- (13) *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum Vol III* :

प्रदानभुजविक्रमप्रशमशास्त्रवाक्योदयै—

रूपयुर्परिसंचयोद्धितमनेकमार्गं यशः ।



पुनाति भुवनत्रयं पशुपतेर्जटान्तर्गुहा-

निरोधपरिमोक्षशीघ्रमिव पाण्डु गार्ग पथः ॥

of. श्वेतगंगावर्तपाण्डुरं पथमिव त्रिभुवनवन्दनीयं त्रिविक्रमस्य ।

(14) Tripathagā Vāyu P. 42. 7., 51. 21, 46; 58 88. Am. I. 10. 31, Hem 1831; M. Bh. 13. 26. 77, Rām. I. 35. 11; 16, ( गंगां त्रिपथगां नदीम् ), I. 36. 3; I. 44. 6; 2. 50. 12; Amaru. 99; Rājatar. 3. 323; Kathās. 4. 30; त्रिपथगामिनी M. Bh. I. 98. 8; Rām. I. 35. 22; Trivartmagā M. Bh. 13. 26. 84, त्रिमार्गा Raghū. 13. 20; त्रिस्रोत Am. I. 10 31; Hem. 1081, Kum. 7. 15.

(15) M. Bh. 2. 42. 11; Hariv. 3. 45. 32, त्रिकूटस्थां गंगां त्रिपथगामिव; M. Bh. 3. 107. ६०, पौत्रश्च ते त्रिपथगां त्रिदिवादानयिष्यति; ७. ८. 47 तत्र दिव्या त्रिपथगा प्रथमा तु प्रतिष्ठिता । ब्रह्मलोकादपक्रान्ता Sak. 7. 6, त्रिस्रोतसं वहति यो गगनप्रतिष्ठाम्; Raghū. 10. 63, कृताभिषेकैर्दिव्यां त्रिस्रोतसि च सप्तभिः । ब्रह्मभिभिः Raghū. 13. 5. सप्तभिहस्तोद्धृतहेमपद्मां.....त्रिस्रोतसं त्र्यम्बकमौलिमालाम् ।

(16) त्रीन् पथो भाजयन्तीति तस्माद् त्रिपथगा स्मृता ।

(17) अलंकृतास्त्रयो लोकाः पथिभिर्विमलैस्त्रिभिः ।

(18) गंगा लोकानां पुण्यदा वै त्रयाणाम् ।

(19) M. Bh. 18. 3. 28 calls Gangā त्रैलोक्यपावनी ।

(20) भूस्थैर्दिविस्थैश्च भुतैश्चावचैरपि ।

गंगा विगाह्या सततम्.....

(21) ख्यातैर्यदस्याः खं दिवं गां च नित्यं पुरा विशो विदिशश्चावतस्ये ।

(22) The world of the Pitrs is here naturally thought of as nether world.  
of. M. Bh. 12 328. 30 :

देवयानचरो विष्णो विदुषाणश्च तामसः ।

द्वौ एतौ प्रेत्य पन्थानौ दिवं चाधश्च गच्छतः ॥

इयं भूत्वा चैकवप्रा शुचिराकाशगा पुनः ।

देवेषु गंगा गन्धर्वं प्राप्नोति अलकनन्दताम् ॥२१॥

तथा पितॄन् वैतरिणी दुस्तरा पापकर्मभिः ।

गंगा भवति वै प्राप्या कृष्णद्वैपायनोऽब्रवीत् ॥२२॥

## पद्मपुराणसुभाषितानि

( पद्मपुराण, आनन्दाश्रमसंस्करण )

स वै पुसां परो धर्मो यतो भक्तिरघोक्षजे ।	१।१।१३
अचिन्त्याः खलु ये भावास्ताञ्च तर्केण साधयेत् ।	१।३।१२
यस्य हस्तौ च पादौ च मनश्चैव सुसंयतम् ।	
विद्या तपश्च कीर्तिश्च स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥	१।१।१९
सदम्भश्च हतो धर्मः क्रोधेनैव हतं तपः ।	
अदृढं च हतं ज्ञानं प्रमादेन हतं श्रुतम् ॥	१।२९।२८
अनभ्यासहता विद्या हतो बोधो विरोधकृत् ।	
जीवनार्थं हतं तीर्थं जीवनार्थं हतं व्रतम् ॥	१।२९।३१
मैत्री सप्तपदी साधो सतां भवति सत्फला ।	१।३१।२०
अहिंसा परमो धर्मो ह्यहिंसैव परं तपः ।	
अहिंसा परमं दानमित्याहुर्मुनयः सदा ॥	१।३१।२७
सर्वे धर्मा अहिंसायां प्रविशन्ति तथा दृढम् ॥	१।३१।३७
ऋषोणां परमं गुह्यमिदं भरतसत्तम ।	
तीर्थाभिगमनं पुण्यं यज्ञैरपि विशिष्यते ॥	१।४९।१५
कृषिकारो यथा देवि क्षेत्रे बीजं सुसंस्थितः ।	
यादृशं तु वषत्येव तादृशं फलमश्नुते ॥	२।७।९
परज्ञानप्रदा या च सा प्रज्ञा परिकथ्यते ।	
प्रज्ञा माता समाख्याता प्राणिनां पालनाय सा ॥	२।८।५९
यथा दीपो निवातस्थः कज्जलं वमते स्थिरम् ।	
तथा दोषान्प्रज्वलित्वा दर्शनं हि प्रयास्यसि ॥	२।८।९९
तस्य पार्श्वं प्रगत्यैव जयकालं प्रतीक्षयेत् ।	
दीपच्छायां समाश्रित्य तमो वर्तेत वै तथा ॥	

स्नेहं दशागतं प्रेक्ष्य दीपस्यापि महाबलम् ।  
 प्रकाशं याति वेगेन तमश्च वर्धते पुनः ॥  
 तथा प्रसाधयेच्छत्रुं स्नेहं निर्दिश्य तत्त्वतः ।  
 स्नेहं कृत्वा सुरैः सार्धं धर्मभावैः सुरद्विषः ॥ २।१०।३९-४१  
 लोभः पापस्य बीजं हि मोहो मूलं च तस्य हि ।  
 असत्यं तस्य स्कन्धो वै मायाशाखा-सुविस्तरः ॥  
 दम्भकौटिल्यपत्राणि कुबुद्ध्या पुष्पितः सदा ।  
 नृशंसं तस्य सौगन्धं फलमज्ञानमेव च ॥  
 छद्मपाखण्डचौर्येण्याः क्रूराः क्रूटाश्च पापिनः ।  
 पक्षिणो मोहवृक्षस्य मायाशाखासमाश्रिताः ॥  
 अज्ञानं यत्फलं तस्य रसोऽधर्मः प्रकीर्तितः ।  
 भावोदकेन संवृद्धिस्तस्याश्रद्धा क्रतुः प्रिय ॥  
 अधर्मः सुरसस्तस्य चोत्कटैर्मधुरायते ।  
 यादृशैश्च फलैश्चैव सुफलो लोभपादपः ॥  
 तस्यच्छायां समाश्रित्य यो नरः परितुष्यते ।  
 फलानि तस्य चाश्नाति सुपक्वानि दिने दिने ॥  
 फलानां तु रसेनापि ह्यधर्मेण तु पालितः ।  
 स संतुष्टो भवेन्मर्त्यः पतनायाभिगच्छति ॥ २।११।१६-२२  
 सतां सङ्गो महापुण्यो बहुक्षेमप्रदायकः । २।१२।१४  
 यथा वह्निप्रसङ्गाच्च मलं त्यजति काञ्चनम् ।  
 तथा सतां हि संसर्गात् पापं त्यजति मानवः ।  
 सत्यवह्निप्रदीप्तश्च प्रज्वलेत्पुण्यतेजसा ॥ २।१३।१९  
 सुक्षेत्रे कर्पको यादृग्बीजं वपति तत्परः ।  
 स तथा भुङ्गते देवि यथा बीजं तथा फलम् ।  
 अन्यथा नैव जायेत तत्सर्वं सदृशं भवेत् ॥ २।१४।१२  
 आत्मा कायश्च द्वावेतौ मित्ररूपावुभावपि ।  
 कार्यं मित्रं परित्यज्य आत्मा याति सुनिश्चितम् ॥ २।१५।५८

- स्कन्धात्स्कन्धे नयन्भारं विश्रामं मन्यते यथा ।  
तद्वत्सर्वमिदं लोके दुःखं दुःखेन शाम्यति ॥ २।६६।२०३
- यथामृत्पिण्डतः कर्ता कुरुते यद्यदिच्छति ।  
तथा पूर्वकृतं कर्म कर्तारमनुगच्छति ॥ २।६१।४२
- इह यत् कियते कर्म फलं तत्रैव भुज्यते ।  
कर्मभूमिरियं राजन्फलभूमिश्च सा स्मृता ॥ २।९५।१२
- यादृशं वपते बीजं तादृशं फलमश्नुते ।  
न वापयति यः क्षेत्रं न स भुञ्जति तत्फलम् ॥ २।९७।५७
- नास्ति ज्ञानसमो दीपः सर्वान्धकारनाशने ।  
अङ्गारसदृशी योषित् सर्षिःकुम्भसमः पुमान् ।  
तस्याः परिसरे ब्रह्मन्स्थातव्यं न कदाचन ॥ ३।१८।१८
- सामान्यं सर्वजन्तूनां बलं धर्मस्तु केवलः ।  
येन संतरते जन्तुरिह लोके परत्र च ॥ ४।९२।६३
- किं विद्यया किं तपसा किं त्यागेन नयेन वा ।  
किं विविक्तेन मनसा स्त्रीभिर्यस्य मनो हृताम् ॥ ४।९५।१४
- परित्यजेदर्थकामौ स्यातां चेद्धर्मवर्जितौ ।  
धर्मेण प्राप्यते सर्वमर्थकामादिकं सुखम् ॥ ४।९५।२६
- श्वास एव चपलः क्षणमध्ये यो गतागतशतानि विधत्ते ।  
जीवितेऽपि तदधीनचेतसा कः समाचरति धर्मविलम्बम् ॥ ४।९५।४९
- प्रमादात् सर्वभूतानि विनश्यन्ति न संशयः ॥ ५।१८।३५७
- लोभात् प्रमादात् विश्रम्भात् त्रिविधैः क्षीयते जगत् ।  
तस्माच्छोभं न कुर्वीत न प्रमादं न विश्वसेत् ॥ ५।१८।३६०
- प्राणत्यागे समुत्पन्ने शपथैर्नास्ति पातकम् ॥ ५।१८।३९१
- उक्त्वाऽनृतं भवेद्यत्र प्राणिनां प्राणरक्षणम् ।  
अनृतं तत्र सत्यं स्यात् सत्यमप्यनृतं भवेत् ॥
- कामिनीषु विवाहेषु गवां मुक्तौ तथैव च ।  
ब्राह्मणानां विपत्तौ च शपथैर्नास्ति पातकम् ॥ ५।१८।३९२-३९३

न सा सभा यत्र न सन्ति वृद्धा वृद्धा न ते ये न वदन्ति धर्मम् ।  
 नासौ हि धर्मो यत्र न सत्यमस्ति न तत्सत्यं यच्छलेनोपपन्नम् ॥ ५।३४।९७  
 द्विविधं च सुखं तावत् पुत्रि लोके विभाव्यते ।  
 शरीरस्यास्य संयोगश्चेतसश्चापि निर्वृतिः ॥ ५।४०।३२२  
 अश्वत्थामा बलिर्व्यासो हनूमांश्च विभीषणः ।  
 कृपः परशुरामश्च सप्तैते चिरजीविनः ॥ ५।४६।७  
 नखिनां च नदीनां च शृङ्गिणां शस्त्रधारिणाम् ।  
 विश्वासो नैव कर्तव्यः स्त्रीणां प्रेप्यजनस्य च ॥  
 न विश्वसेदविश्वस्ते विश्वस्ते नातिविश्वसेत् ।  
 विश्वासाद्भयमुत्पन्नं मूलादपि निकृन्तति ॥ ५।१८।३६३-३६४  
 गन्धः सर्वत्र सततमाप्रातव्यः प्रयत्नतः ।  
 गावः पश्यन्ति गन्धेन राजानश्चारचक्षुषा ॥ ५।१८।३६६  
 यथा हि पथिकः कश्चिच्छायामाश्रित्य तिष्ठति ।  
 विश्रम्य च पुनर्गच्छेत्तद्भूतसमागमः ॥ ५।१८।३६८  
 लोको वदति वाक्यानि चन्दनं किल शीतलम् ।  
 पुत्रगात्रपरिष्वङ्गश्चन्दनादपि शीतलः ॥ ५।१८।३७५  
 सुजनो न याति विकृतिं परहितनिरतो विनाशकालेऽपि ।  
 छिन्नोऽपि चन्दनतरुः सुरभयति मुखं कुठारस्य ॥ ६।७।२३  
 ते साधवो भुवनमण्डलमौलिभूता  
 ये साधुतामनुपकारिषु दर्शयन्ति ।  
 आत्मप्रयोजनवशात्कृतछिन्नदेहः  
 पूर्वोपकारिषु खलोऽपि हितानुरक्तः ॥ ६।७।२५  
 अन्यस्माल्लब्धोऽप्या नीचः प्रायेण दुःसहो भवति ।  
 रविरपि न तपति तादृग् यादृशं तपति बालुका-निकरः ॥ ६।८।१४

# THE OLD-JAVANESE AGASTYAPARVAN

BY

J. GONDA.

[ हालेण्डदेशनिवासिना डा० 'जि० गोन्डा' नाम प्रसिद्धविदुषा जावादेशे प्राप्तस्य 'अगस्त्यपर्व' नाम्नः प्राचीनग्रन्थस्य विषये विमर्शोऽत्र प्रस्तुतः । जावाद्वीपे भारतीयसंस्कृतिसम्बन्धिनो द्विविधाः प्राचीना ग्रन्थाः प्राप्यन्ते—मूलसंस्कृतग्रन्थानां जावाभाषान्तररूपा ग्रन्थाः, प्राचीनं भारतीयसंस्कृतवाङ्मयमनुसृत्य च रचिता ग्रन्थाः । जावा-ब्रह्माण्ड-पुराणमिव केचिद् ग्रन्था मूलसंस्कृतग्रन्थानामुद्धरणानि प्रदाय ततोऽनन्तरं तेषां जावाभाषान्तरं व्याख्यानं च ( वा ) चक्रुः । 'अगस्त्यपर्व' नाम जावादेशीयो ग्रन्थः एतामेव पद्धतिमनुसरति । तस्य रचनाकालोऽनवगतः । अस्य ग्रन्थस्य श्रीगोन्डामहोदयेन सम्पादनं डचभाषान्तरं च कृतम् ( १९३३-३६ ई० ) । अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे गुरोरगस्त्यस्य स्वपुत्रेण दृढस्युना सह पौराणिकाः संवादा वर्तन्ते । अत्र बहूनि संस्कृतोद्धरणान्यपि सन्ति येषां विषयसाम्यं धर्मशास्त्रग्रन्थ-महाभारत-पुराणादिभिः सह वर्तते, परन्तु कोऽप्येकः संस्कृतग्रन्थोऽस्य मूलत्वेन नाद्यावधि ज्ञातम् । अत्रोद्धृतानामनेकेषां संस्कृतश्लोकानां मूलमपि नोपलभ्यते । यद्यप्यत्र पौराणिकान्याख्यानानि वंशवर्णनानि च पुराणेष्विवैव वर्तन्ते, परन्त्वत्र कतिचिद् धार्मिका विषया असाधारणा अपि सन्ति । अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे दृढस्युक्तान् द्वाविंशतिप्रश्नाननुसृत्य त्रयोविंशतिरध्यायाः सन्ति । आद्याश्वत्वारोऽध्यायास्तु प्रास्ताविकाः, शेषेषु च ब्रह्मषिवंशानां, प्रधानतः इक्ष्वस्य तस्य संततेश्च, वर्णनं वर्तते, यत्रान्तराऽन्तरा बहून्याख्यानमिश्रितानि धर्म-दर्शन-नीतिविषयकाणि प्रवचनान्यपि सन्ति । किमेतानि प्रवचनानि प्रक्षेपरूपाणि उत मूलरूपाणि, कश्च संस्कृतग्रन्थोऽस्य मूलमित्यादयः प्रश्ना अप्यत्रोपस्थिता भवन्ति । ]

Among the many ancient Javanese texts which are either translated from Sanskrit or deal with subjects borrowed from the Indian religious, juridical or traditional literature, and which therefore are of the highest importance for any student of Indian religion and literature, there are some which attract our special attention, or excite our interest because their Indian model or prototype has hitherto not been traced. Although it would be too much to hope that in the future we shall be able to detect

the source or the author of any Old-Javanese passage written in Sanskrit, it may be recalled to mind that in the last decennium one of these vexing problems has been felicitously solved. We now know, by the joint efforts of the Indian scholar Manomohan Ghosh and the Dutch professor Dr. C. Hooykaas, that the author of the great and famous Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa ( $\pm$  925 A. D.) has, in about the first 65% of his work, followed Bhaṭṭi's version of the epic subject matter, that is to say the well-known poem Bhaṭṭikāvya.<sup>1</sup> We now know also that the Javanese poet has, like his model, endeavoured also to make his work exemplary from the point of view of theoretical poetics by applying the rules of alaṃkāraśāstra.

It does not seem impossible that in the future more light may be shed on the origin and the composition of other Javanese works which, while dealing with Indian subject-matter, either follow, like the Rāmāyaṇa, Indian models and rules of composition, or consist, like the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa<sup>2</sup>, largely of Sanskrit quotations followed by Javanese translations and (or) explanations. One of the texts belonging to the latter class—which may be given the general name of translational prose—is the so-called Agastyaparvan. This interesting Old-Javanese treatise, of unknown date and considerable length, was at the time edited and translated (into Dutch) by myself<sup>3</sup>. Filling, in print, about 60 pages, it consists in the usual way, of a conversation between a guru, *in casu* the famous sage Agastya, and a disciple or interrogator, his son Dṛḍhasyu. In this conversation the former does, of course, most of the talking. As to its contents and composition this book may, generally speaking, be called a work of the Purāṇa variety. Although the Agastyaparvan, like for instance also the Javanese adaptation of the

---

1. See C. Hooykaas, in *Madjalah untuk ilmu bahasa, ilmu bumi dan khibudajaan Indonesia* 86 (Djakarta 1958).

2. See my article *The Old-Javanese Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa in Purāṇa*, II (1960), p. 252.

3. *Agastyaparva*, by J. Gonda, 's-Gravenhage 1933–1936 published by the Institute voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, in the *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, vol. 90; 92; 94, and also separately in one volume.

parvans of the Mahābhārata, is interlarded with Sanskrit quotations, it is as yet impossible to say whether it was, like the Mahābhārata, Brahmandapurāṇa etc., modelled upon, or even meant to be an adapted version of a Sanskrit text. We are not even able to say whether it is a complete work or only part of a larger text. Although the contents of many passages can be, more or less easily, traced in Sanskrit works (dharma-śāstras, Mahābhārata, Purāṇas), no single Sanskrit work or part of a larger work has come to my knowledge which is in the main identical with the contents of this Javanese document. And although part of the Sanskrit quotations do not differ much from similar ślokas in Indian books, there are exceptions, and the question may arise as to the source of these non-identified stanzas. Moreover, while part of the contents are well-known purāṇic myths, tales, genealogies etc., which remind us of parallels in the Old-Javanese Brahmandapurāṇa, other passages, especially those of a more theological character, are not always well represented in Sanskrit literature, however much they resemble, in purport and character, and often also in detail, similar episodes in many Indian works of the epic, śāstric and purāṇic varieties. In short, although there are other ancient Javanese texts which deal, at least in part, with the same subject-matter—e. g. the Saṅ hyaṅ Kamahāyanikan<sup>4</sup>, the Koravāsrama<sup>5</sup>—the Agastyaparvan does not fail to confront us with intriguing problems.

The twenty-two questions put by young Dīḍhasyu suggest a convenient division in twenty-three chapters or paragraphs, not all of which are however strictly speaking completely relevant. After four introductory chapters, almost the entire book consists of a relation of the genealogy of the brahmaṇsis, especially of Dakṣa and his offspring. These genealogies, however, serve as a framework encompassing brief treatises of a didactic, theological or philosophical character—which however constitute the essential part of the subject-matter—, alternating with short

4. Edited by J. Kats, The Hague 1910.

5. Edited by J. L. Swellengrebel, Thesis Leiden 1926.



stories or legends connected with one of the persons mentioned in the course of the author's expositions. The problem arises as to how the 'philosophical' passages were inserted in the genealogical and legendary framework; do the former constitute real insertions or was the text conceived as a whole?

It would be convenient to insert here a somewhat abridged English translation of the Dutch table of contents which I composed in my above publication (Bijdr. T.L.V. 92, p. 338-340; separate publication p. 94-95): Ch. I introduction, Agastya and his son hold a conversation. Ch. II: Dṛḍhasyu wishes to receive some information about the origin of the world; his father gives an exposition of creation and pralaya, of earth, atmosphere, heaven and subterranean worlds and abodes, of the well-known Sāṃkhya doctrine of the elements and their successive emanation. At the time of the Mahāpralaya the Lord Sadāśiva—the whole of the treatise is decidedly Śivaite in character—is the only being in existence. It is He who, wishing to create the universe, causes the elements to come into existence. Ch. III deals in a similar way with the origin of the brahmarṣis and the manus; Ch. IV with the manvantaras. In Ch. V the daughters of Dakṣa, their husbands and children are enumerated. Then the author proceeds to discuss, in Ch. VI, the causes and reasons for which beings go to heaven or hell; the results of a sinful life are demonstrated by means of an explication of special sins and demerits. The journey of the ātman after death towards heaven or hell; the tortures of hell; reincarnation in accordance with one's merits or demerits in the previous earthly existence; the concepts of *tapas*, *yajña* and *kīrti* (a general term for founding buildings, parks, fountains etc. for religious purposes or for gaining religious merit) etc. are the subjects of Ch. VII; they are illustrated by examples and followed by an expatiation on those daughters of Dakṣa's who had not yet been made mention of, viz., the thirteen who married Kaśyapa. With reference to the eldest of them, Aditi, whose twelve children are enumerated, Dṛḍhasyu asks (Ch. VIII) for what reason these children of Aditi were gods. The cause of

their divinity, Agastya answers, was the very character of their mother, a statement leading him to a general discussion of the characters of gods and *saptarṣis*. The genealogies of the children of Kaśyapa and the other daughters of Dakṣa, which is the next subject, is followed by some digressions on Indra who after slaying Prahlaḍa attempts to kill Diti's second child: he enters the body of the expectant mother, for which reason he is called *Puramḍara*. Because of his *brahmahatyā*—the idea is explained—he cannot return to his heavenly abode; the *brahmahatyā* falls, as a thread, to the earth to be present, at night, in various fruits, milk, butter, and honey, and, by day, in women. The genealogies are continued. In Chapter IX the character of Diti is said to be the cause of the *daitya* nature of her issue, which is compared with men and gods in respect of their mastering of the *ṣaḍvarga* (*kāma*, *krodha*, *lobha* etc.). In a similar way the character of the *gandharvas* is explained from that of their mother *Prabhā* (Ch. X), *Vinatā*'s character is discussed in connection with her son *Garuḍa*. Mention is also made of *Kadrū*'s offspring (Ch. XI), which consists of snakes, a fact the cause of which is again said to lie in their mother's character. The genealogy is continued. When the *yakṣas* are mentioned, Agastya explains (Ch. XIII) why they are keepers of treasures. Thereupon the narrative passes on to the churning of the ocean, the *ṣaḍvarga* which are to be controlled by men and the origin of which lies in the *antaḥkaraṇa* (the well-known concept of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy). In Ch. XIV it is taught that the *ahankāra* should be destroyed or nullified by *yoga*. There follows an excursion on the so-called *trikāya puramārti*, i. e. the well-known group of *kāyika*, *vācika* and *mānasika* activities or *kāya*, *vāk* and *citta*. In a continuation of the genealogy (Ch. XV) the animals are, in a long passage, said to be the children of *Pulaha*. Some doctrines concerning reincarnation are added, with special reference to the question as to why a being may descend to lower and lower births. Agastya then proceeds (Ch. XVI) to explain the deliverance of those who have sunk low. After other genealogical observations

he makes some remarks on the biological contributions of fathers and mothers to the constitution of their children in general and on the rules of conduct to be observed during the cohabitation. After some comment (Ch. XVII) on the family of Dakṣa's son-in-law Bhṛgu, mention is made of Aurva and Paraśu-Rāma. The latter's intention was (Ch. XVIII) to reach the highest of the sixteen tattvas, viz. final emancipation. In a next paragraph the yoga required to reach the various stages and grades is described, and also (Ch. XIX) the conditions to be fulfilled by those who want to become *devatās*, among which are in the first place the three *vratas* (the so-called *akroḍha*, *alobha*, *śokavarjita*). If one is not able to live up to these principles there is, Ch. XX says, another way, viz. rendering homage to a paṇḍita and being initiated by him. These observations are followed by a description of the qualities of persons who devote themselves to a religious and spiritual life, who want to be able and qualified gurus, etc. and by a passage on the *dhikṣā* and related subjects. In Ch. XXI Agastya deals with the offspring of Aṅgiras and Marīci's daughter Surūpā, in Ch. XXII with the other relatives of Pulastya who had also married Ilā, a daughter of Tṛṇabindu. In connection with the names of Raghu, Dilipa, and Rāmabhadra in the ensuing genealogical account, Dr̥ḥasyu asks how these kings behaved so that the world became happy and prosperous (Ch. XXIII). The answer is: they, and each of the *caturvarṇa*, followed the dharma. Here the text ends without adding, for instance, the statement that father and son discontinue their conversation.

As is well known many legends centre round the figure of the narrator Agastya, the sage and great champion of Aryan civilization in the South.<sup>6</sup> Part of these legends appear in the epics and purāṇas to preserve the memory of a vast and important cultural movement, the Hinduization of Southern India

6. A. K. Nilakanta Sastri, a History of South India, Oxford 1955, p. 64 ff.; the same, History of India, 12, Madras 1953, p. 170 f.; K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar, in R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalkar, The History and Culture of the Indian people, II, Bombay 1953, p. 290 ff.

Agastya was also worshipped in Further India and Indonesia.<sup>7</sup> His role as a saint and as the promoter of Hinduization and preacher of Śivaism in the island of Java is well attested by epigraphy, sculpture and literature.<sup>8</sup> Mention may, for instance, be made of the Dinaya inscription (A. D. 760) recording how the ruler of East Java, who was a great devotee of the saint, made a fine abode for him, installing his image of black stone in the place of the wooden image set up by his ancestors. The Agastyaparvan however does not shed much light on the Javanese Agastya-worship, although it stands a fair chance of having enjoyed special popularity because of the prevalence of that worship in the archipelago.

The role played by the sage in the treatise under consideration is, although unknown from other Indonesian texts, not uncommon in India. There are in India many works or episodes in which Agastya appears as the author, narrator or interrogator. Already in the R̥gveda, no less than 27 hymns (1, 165-171) are attributed to him. The Mahābhārata informs us of his marriage with Lopāmudrā and the birth of his son Dr̥ḥhasyu.<sup>9</sup> In the Rāmāyaṇa the sage explains to Rāma the origin of the rākṣasas, adding a long genealogical account of their families (Rām. 7, 4 ff.). The cantos 1-36 of the VII book of the Rāmāyaṇa, being not intrinsically related to the main theme of the epic, essentially are a concatenation of 'ancient history' and genealogies, and as such are of a 'pauṇic' character. As to its form and composition this section is an 'Agastyaparvan', because it is Agastya who after having, at

---

7. Nilakanta Sastri, *South Indian Influences in the Far East*, Bombay 1949, p. 59; 128 f.; 170; R. C. Majumdar, in *Majumdar Pusalkar, o.c.*, IV, p. 418. ff.

8. R. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya in den Archipel*, Thesis Leiden 1926; Nilakanta Sastri, *Agastya*, in *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, uitgegeven door het Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen 1936, p. 471 ff.

9. See A. Holtzmann, *Der heilige Agastya nach den Erzählungen des Mahābhārata*, in *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 34 (1889), p. 589 ff.

the head of a delegation of ṛṣis, approached Rāma, gives him the information wanted. In the same Uttarakāṇḍa Agastya is also the narrator of sargas 77-82 which may again be regarded as 'paurāṇic': Daṇḍa, a descendant of Manu, interfered with a daughter of his purohita Uśanas who therefore cursed him so that he and his country were reduced to ashes. Did the original author of the Old-Javanese document under consideration draw on these passages or was he inspired by them to write a larger work on genealogies?

In the Purāṇas there are also some episodes in which the sage appears as the narrator or as a studious listener. The beginning of the Pātālakhaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa bears a striking resemblance to the introductory passage of the Uttarakāṇḍa. Another circumstantial account ascribed to Agastya occurs in the Varāhapurāṇa, 51 ff: here the sage relates, *inter alia*, the story of king Paśupāla, adding some instruction of Viṣṇu worship (*vrata*s etc), a legend dealing with Nārada, an account of the conduct of the *varṇas* in the different *yugas*, on *agamyāgamana* and some stories in connection with the narrator himself. There is a considerable difference in content between this episode and the Javanese book; yet, the former could be considered an 'Agastyaparvan'. There is further a work that, passing under the name of Devīpurāṇa, is a semitāntric purāṇa, glorifying the power of the great goddess and professing to be revealed by Agastya to Nṛpavāhana; it is related to the ṛṣis by the muni Vasiṣṭha. An Agastya-smṛti<sup>10</sup> lays down the rules for the acts and religious rites which a brahman should perform from the early morning until late into the evening. Agastya-sūtras expounding the bhakti of the Devī-Bhāgavata and bearing resemblance to the Nārada and Śaṇḍilya-sūtras were at the time (1897) studied in volume III of the Sanskrit Journal of Madras<sup>11</sup>. The Arabic author Alberuni made mention of "the book Agastyamata,

10. A triennial Catalogue of mss., Madras 1912/4-1915/6, 1809, no. 994 h.

11. J. N. Farquhar, An Outline of the Religious Literature of India, Oxford 1920, p. 202 and 359.

composed by Agastya, treating of the subject that in all investigations we must use the apperception of the senses as well as the tradition"<sup>12</sup>

As is well known, there are many texts which profess to belong to, or to form part of, one of the purāṇas. One of these is an Agastyasamhitā in which the sage and his brother Sutikṣṇa hold a conversation (*sutikṣṇāgastyasamvāda*); according to its colophon,<sup>13</sup> it belongs to the Bṛahmāṇḍapurāṇa and contains at least thirty-five chapters. Such a text has however not been incorporated into that purāṇa, as it is known to us from printed editions. And many 'Agastyasamhitās' are, in a similar way, said to form part of the conglomerate of traditions known as Skandapurāṇa. These writings deal, in a general way, with religious subjects, such as *prāyaścittas*, *śānti*, *mudrālakṣaṇas*, worship, *dharma*, religious traditions etc. The Old-Javanese work stands therefore a fair chance of being an adaptation of a Sanskrit text of this category, the original of which has hitherto remained obscure. In any case the Javanese treatise is, as to its spirit and contents, paurāṇic, this term to be taken in its wider sense. It does not only contain cosmology, ancient history, legends and genealogies, but also episodes of a philosophical and theological nature. At the same time it reminds us of that category of religious works which is known as āgamas, a technical term which even occurs in the text itself—p. 382 (54); 389 (61); 391 (6<sup>2</sup>)—expressing the sense of "traditional doctrine." Although this large body of literature is closely related to the tantras, the evidence pointing to mutual borrowing and percolation of ideas, it would be incorrect to consider the Javanese Agastyaparvan a tantristic document or even to assume<sup>14</sup> that it may shed light on the origin and provenance of tantristic tenets and rites in the island of Java.

12. Alberuni, India, ed. Sachau (1887), p. 64; English translation by Sachau (1910), I, p. 132.

13. See A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Mss., Madras XVI, p. 6297, no. 8682.

14. With Dr. Th. G. Th. Pigeaud, De Tantu Panggelaran, Thesis Leiden 1924, p. 325.

As already observed, the Javanese work is Śivaite in character. It is Śiva who, as Sadāśiva, creates the universe and his name is repeatedly mentioned. The term Śivabhakti occurs in a Sanskrit stanza, the name Śivāditya is well known to the author. The god is however neither the author nor the narrator, a function ascribed to him by the authors of the tantras. No mention is made of the worship of Devī. In relating the creation of the world the *prakṛti* is not identified with Śiva's *śakti*. The *pañcatattva*, *yantras*, *mudrās*, *nyāsa* and the doctrine of *mantras* are left undiscussed. In describing the *varṇāśramas* no mention is made of the *sāmānyas*. Such female divinities and personifications as Rati, Aditi, Puṣṭi, Tuṣṭi, Svadhā are not represented, as they are in the tantras, as partial incarnations of the Female Principle. If we follow the definition proposed by Sir John Woodroffe<sup>16</sup>: "where there is *mantra*, *yantra*, *nyāsa*, *dikṣā*, *guru* and the like, there is Tantra Shāstra", the text cannot be described as written under the influence of Tāntrism. Only some passages may be said to tend towards Tantrism. For instance, whereas most of the tāntristic topics are absent, the high position of the spiritual teacher, the *dikṣā* and the discussion of some rites point at least in that direction.

The paragraphs devoted, in Chapter XX, to the *guru* and his functions are indeed of some interest because they clearly show the power and influence of the spiritual guide and importance of his position. He represents Sadāśiva. The qualities required to be a good guru are discussed at some length. One of his privileges is the initiation of the adepts (the *dikṣā*), that is to say the admission into the religious community, the ordination by which the adepts are brought into immediate contact with the divinity. As a whole and in general however, the text represents, from the point of view of dogmatics, that mixture of Sāṃkhya and Vedānta ideas which is characteristic of many Indian works of the paurāṇic variety; from the point of view of ethics it is, in the main, in agreement with the doctrines

---

16. Sir John Woodroffe, *Shakti and Shākta* 3, London 1929, p. 58.

of Manu—whose name is mentioned—and the Bhagavadgītā ; it gives evidence of acquaintance with a fully developed yoga system on the basis of the general Hinduistic, and in particular Sivaite, conceptions.

It seems however possible to determine the religious and literary position of the Old-Javanese work somewhat more precisely. Although the many (about 155) Sanskrit quotations which it contains are, generally speaking, not identical with stanzas occurring in Vāyu-Brahmāṇḍa version of the purāṇic themes, the text itself not rarely reminds us of these two works. This is not strange because the Brahmanḍapurāṇa was at least in part translated into Javanese. There is a considerable number of passages in which proper names, the sequence of the facts related and other details, while being different from the corresponding passages in the other sources, are in agreement with the Brahmanḍa-Vāyu texts. For instance, p. 349, 14 six of the twelve *sādhya*s are mentioned by name ; these names look very much like those in Bmḍ. 2, 3, 17 ; Vā. 66, 16 ; they do not however occur in other purāṇas. Moreover, the colophon points in this direction, because it says that the Agastyaparvan is a *piturun* of the Brahmanḍa-purāṇa. This Javanese word ("incarnation, descendant") is no doubt intended to inform us that the text goes back to that purāṇa, or is an adaptation of subject-matter contained in it. The question however remains as to which Agastyaparvan—the Javanese work or an Indian prototype—and which Brahmanḍapurāṇa are meant, for in a minority of cases the Agastyaparvan, while joining other purāṇas varies from the Brahmanḍa text. In a few cases the closest resemblance is to the Old-Javanese Brahmanḍapurāṇa.

Let us now turn to a discussion of some other points of importance. Whereas, to begin with, the patriarch Dakṣa and his spouse Prasūti had, according to the Old-Javanese Brahmanḍapurāṇa, 24 daughters, 13 of whom were married to Dharma and 11 to 11 other men, the Agastyaparvan gives them 51 daughters, 13 of whom became Prajāpati's wives and 12 the ladies of



Dakṣa's brothers; on the others the text is silent. Dakṣa however had according to the Agastyaparvan, also another wife, Asiktiki—i. e. Asiknī—, Vīraṇa's daughter, who gave him 10 daughters who married Dharma, and 27 daughters who became the wives of the Moon. Elsewhere the same work states that Dakṣa had another 13 daughters who married Kaśyapa; their mother (perhaps Prasūti?) is left unmentioned. The version of the Brahmanḍapurāṇa has the support of a number of Indian purāṇas, although the number of Dakṣa's daughters and their husbands varied greatly. In the main, however, there are two versions of the paragraphs dealing with Dakṣa's family; according to the one he had 50 or 60 (mother: Asiknī), according to the other 24 daughters (mother: Prasūti). Curiously enough, both versions are often found in the same purāṇa (Padma, Viṣṇu, Kūrma, Liṅga, Brahmanḍa, Vāyu), but then Dakṣa's marriage with Prasūti is said to have taken place in Svāyambhuva-manvantara, his wedding with Asiknī, in another existence, in cākṣuṣamanvantara. In the Agastyaparvan, however, no mention is made of two different manvantaras, and the number 51 is strange, although the names of the 13 wives of Prajāpati are in harmony with those of Dakṣa's daughters, who according to the Indian texts and the Old-Javanese Brahmanḍapurāṇa married Dharma. The conclusion must be that in the Agastyaparvan, two traditions seem to have been fused without any attempt at accounting for Dakṣa's two marriages. May we infer from this that the version it presents is younger than that of those purāṇas which assume the rebirth of Dakṣa in a later manvantara? And may we arrive at the same conclusion on the strength of the assumption that the number 51 is a detail of a version of the story in which the 10 daughters who married Dharma, the 27 who married the Moon, and the 14 wives of Kaśyapa were added up, a younger version making these 51 girls the daughters of Prasūti and marrying them off otherwise?

A closely connected passage is that dealing with the *nakṣatras*, i. e. the 27 spouses of Soma. In enumerating them the Agastyaparvan resembles the version of the Sanskrit

Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyupurāṇas more closely than other texts. Unlike the Nakṣatrakalpa (Atharvaparīśiṣṭa I), 1, 1 ff. etc. the Javanese work mentions 27, not 28, nakṣatras and begins with Aśvinī, not with the Kṛttikā. A comparison between the relevant data contained in the Agastyaparvan on the one hand and the Javanese and Balinese astrological calendars<sup>16</sup> on the other shows that the former, it is true, mentions also the Javanese names of the constellations, but agrees only in one single case with the latter in respect of their identification with the Sanskrit names. This point is of some interest because in the opinion of some scholars the Javanese had adopted the Sanskrit names to indicate constellations for which they had already, a more or less systematical nomenclature of their own ; after that their astrological calendar did not, however,—according to the same scholars—include or refer to the Indian nakṣatra names. Interestingly enough, the Agastyaparvan actually gives, in part of the cases, such an identification of Indonesian terms and nakṣatra names : “As to the constellations called in popular speech the head of the pig Damaluṅ, that is Puṣya”. In other cases such an identification fails to turn up, but the author while mentioning the Sanskrit names of the nakṣatras attempts, by describing their outward form to make clear which constellation is meant : “if you see a constellation like a vehicle it is Rohiṇī”. The conclusion seems to be that for the latter category there were no Indonesian names<sup>17</sup>).

Turning now to some other details it may be observed that the contents of Chapters VI and VII—an account of the miserable consequences of sinful behaviour—is generally speaking in perfect harmony with a considerable number of Indian parallels<sup>18</sup>. The narrative is amplified by many examples of

16. See A Maass, *Sternkunde und Sterndeuterei im malaischen Archipel* [Astronomy and astrology in Indonesia, in German], in *Tijdschrift T. L. V.* 64 (1924), p. 183 ff.

17. For particulars I refer to my above publication, *Bijdr. T. L. V.* 92, p. 361 (sep. publ. p. 120).

18. For a comparison between the data contained in the Agastya parvan and in other Old-Javanese sources the reader may be referred to my article

special cases in which diseases and physical defects arose from the sins committed in a former life. The description of the tortures to which the sinners are subjected in the nether world, the sojourn in heaven of the well-conducted who are distinguished for asceticism, sacrifices and what is called *kīrti*, i.e. *dharmakriyā* (cf. Manu 12, 31), the digression on the five *mahāyājñas* and other particulars are completely Indian. In order to characterize the style and composition of the work a passage may be quoted and, as far as the Javanese is concerned, translated here. The stanza which after emendation—almost all Sanskrit passages have been handed down in a more or less corrupted form—reads as follows (p. 351 or 23): *śarīrajaiḥ karmadoṣair yāti sthāvaratām naraḥ śaikaiḥ pakṣimigatām mānasair antyajātitām* (= Manu 12, 9; cf. also Yājñavalkya 3, 134-136) is in the usual way paraphrased and explained: "that is to say: if there is a human being whose behaviour is in all respects wrong, who gives pain to the people who see him, without however resorting to malicious speech and sinful thoughts—who however does not know how to behave decently—, when such a human being dies, he will become a plant, a tree. The man however who uses bad language, who does not know how to express himself properly, who does not know how to behave decently,—when such a human being dies, he will become a plant, a tree. The man, however, who uses bad language, who does not know how to express himself properly, who does not know how to behave decently, qualities which, however, are not accompanied by a wicked state of mind, but whenever he speaks, he offends the ears of those who listen to him—when such a man dies, he will be reborn as a forest-animal or a bird. The man who is without a good mind, whose state of mind is exclusively and uninterruptedly engrossed with envy, anger, and avarice, whose heart is base (?), when such a man dies, he will be a barbarian (*mleccha*). His condition will be worse than that of those who

---

'Karma and Retributive Justice in Ancient Java', which is to appear in the Volume in honour of Dr. B.C. Majumdar, Calcutta.

are reborn as trees, because it is difficult for those who are called barbarians to obtain emancipation. The trees, however, and the animals, it is their destination (?) to be emancipated. Thus that which is done with the body, with words and with the mind constitutes the lowest, middle and highest categories”.

The next śloka runs as follows : *dharmasūlāṃ loka draṣṭum naśchuti kātaraḥ | pretyabhūtya vācakaḥ syād mahānauravasambharuḥ* (for blindness as a result of sins in a preceding existence see e. g. Manu 11, 52 ; Viṣṇusmṛti 45, 20 etc.). I have not succeeded in tracing the source of this śloka, which in all probability was followed by a pendant which though omitted in the Javanese text as this is known to us, has been paraphrased as follows : “but who rejoices in seeing (people) liking fisticuffs, people thumping and kicking, people who cudgel and injure other people, the character of such a man produces the effect of being reborn as a blind man, because the Lord has created the eyes for the purpose of seeing virtuous and correct behaviour”.

The genealogies which are the subject of the framework of Chapters XV-XVII are, in the main, in agreement with the Brahmaṇḍa-Vāyu version. Here also there are some striking differences in detail, among other things a moralizing passage in connection with the story of Jaṭāyu which does not occur in the parallel texts. Jaṭāyu, it is told, has become a god because he has done many services to his fellow-men. Therefore the great mass of the people should follow his example and exert themselves to the utmost, conferring benefits upon others, so that they may be purified and their behaviour justified. A wise man does not want to be favoured by the rich, because the recompense does not fall to him. Those who accept gifts without scruples are avaricious, they will be reborn as women and become the wives of the rich who were their benefactors.

Attention may also be drawn to Chapter XVIII containing, *inter alia*, a description of the *muktapada*, in which the names and terminology of different religious schools and

communities are enumerated in succession (p. 385 ; 57) : the text makes mention of the Yogitapakṣa (?) who call the abode of the emancipated *yogādīparamanērātmya* ; of the adherents of the Bhairavamārga who give it the name of *anantaparamānanda* ; of the Śaivas Pāśupatas and the adepts of the Siddhānta doctrine according to whom it is the *yogādīparamaguhyā* ; and the Vaiṣṇavas who call it *niṣkalaparamaśūnya*<sup>19</sup>. This paragraph reminds us of a passage in the Buddhist Javanese text *Saṅhyaṅ Kamahāyānikan*, b 44 ff.<sup>20</sup>

Another chapter is devoted to the obligations of the social classes and stations in life (XXIII), a favourite subject of *smṛtis* and *purāṇas*. The passage dealing with permissible and forbidden marriages between members of the four classes is however of a striking brevity and succinctness: one should marry a person of one's own class, a man may however also choose a girl from the next lower class. As is well known *śavarna*—was, e. g. by Baudhāyana (1, 8, 16, 6), defined as "the son of a couple belonging to the same *varṇa* or class, or of a father who belonged to the next higher class to that of the mother".

There are also some paragraphs which cannot go back to Indian sources and must therefore be of Javanese origin. To these passages belong, for instance, a reference to a certain Uḍug basur (Ch. VIII ; p. 363 or 35) : the *daitya* Gaveṣṭhi or Kālanemi is said to have been the grandfather of Uḍug Basur who in olden times destroyed the island of Java. As this figure reminds us of Budug basu or Udubasu, a legendary dog which—according to traditions handed down in the Western provinces of the island of Java—wished to destroy the rice which had recently been given to men, there can be no doubt that here a Javanese mythological or legendary figure has been incorporated into the Indian genealogy. It may be

19. See also R. Goris, *Bijdrage tot de kennis der Oud-Javaansche en Balineesche Theologie*, Thesis Leiden 1926, p. 101 ff.

20. See J. S. Speyer, in *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 67, p. 352.

observed that Kālanemi's behaviour (see Viṣṇupur. 5, 12 ff.) bears resemblance to the story of Budug basu, because he also infested the residences of men.

In Chapter XXII Agastya refers to Viśrava(s), the son of Pulastya and Ilā. Ilā was the daughter of king Tṛṇabindu, who is said to have been Agastya's pupil and to have devoted himself to asceticism in the island of Java. Observing that Tṛṇavindu (as he writes the name) now is among the *saptarṣis* the author adds that he was one of those *siddhayaogīśvaras* who lived in that island, the others being Harideva and Anaka), who was the ascetic of the Dihyañ (Dieng) plateau in Java and Mārkaṇḍeya, who lived, likewise as an ascetic, on the mountain Damaluñ. Tṛṇabindu—who is, e. g. also in the Mahābhārata called a muni (3, 263, 5 etc)—is a figure of frequent occurrence in Javanese art and literature<sup>21</sup>. Harideva may in all probability be identified with Haricandana who was worshipped at the same place<sup>22</sup>, viz. the Dieng. Mārkaṇḍeya was (as *Karmaṇḍeya*!) according to the Javanese work Tantu Panggelaran, p. 59 a devaguru on the Kailāsa and, as the successor of the gods, the first human devaguru of the first Javanese *maṇḍala* (*āśrama* or hermitage) Sukuyajña; the same text (p. 126 f.) informs us that *Agasti* (sic) was his successor. It is difficult to say whether these passages go back to the scholar who translated and adapted the Agastyaparvan and who may, anyhow, be considered the author of the Javanese text, or to an 'editor' or copyist.

Some words may finally be added on the date of the Agastya-Parvan. As is usually the case with ancient Javanese treatises of this category, no reliable data are available. Anyhow, it must be much older than the Koravāśrama which seems to have been compiled in the 15th cent. A. D., because that

21. See e. g. F. D. K. Bosch, *Nijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 57, p. 434 ff.; Bigeaud, o. c., p. 285 f.; Boerbatjaraka, o. c., p. 41; 55; 92 ff.

22. See e. g. H. J. Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis* 2, 's-Gravenhage 1931, p. 183; 193 (with references).

book in a curious passage mentions the work under consideration, as well as the Uttarakhaṇḍa, among the books of the Mahābhārata: this can only mean that the author regarded it as a classic and as contemporaneous with the epic 'parvans.' The Agastyaparvan may also be older than the recension C of the Sañ hyaṇ Kamahāyānikan which to all appearance is a younger hinduistic adaptation of this originally buddhist work, because the author (or a redactor?) of this recension—which, however, is of uncertain date, though much older than the Koravāśrama—borrowed some lines from the former treatise. Judging from the style, the grammatical forms and the vocabulary of the text, it can hardly be considered much younger than the adaptation of the books of the Mahābhārata which may roughly speaking date from about 1000 A. D.

# A NOTE ON PUṢKARA-MĀHĀTMYA OR THE SO CALLED PADMA-PURĀṆA SAMUCCAYA

BY

ASOKE CHATTERJEE

[स्वतन्त्ररूपेण रचितान्यनेकानि माहात्म्यानि पद्मपुराणान्तर्गतानीति ख्याप्यन्ते । पद्मपुराणसमुच्चयाभिधं 'पुष्करमाहात्म्यम्' अपि कश्चित् स्वतन्त्र एव ग्रन्थो वर्तते । अस्यैको हस्तलेखः कलकत्तास्थानीय-एशिया-टिकसोसाइटीसविधे विद्यते । अयं ग्रन्थः प्राचीनपद्मपुराणस्य पर्वदिविभागः प्रथमखण्ड-द्वितीयखण्डात्मकं विभागं च सूचयति । पार्वतीयाः दक्षिणोत्तराश्च ब्राह्मणाः गर्हिताः, पार्वतीयाश्च श्राद्धेष्वनिमन्त्रणीयाः कथिताः ।

पुष्करं नाम तीर्थं तु ब्राह्मसम्प्रदायस्यैव प्रधानं स्थानं प्रसिद्धम् । परन्तु 'पुष्करमाहात्म्य' ग्रन्थे शाक्तसम्प्रदायस्यैव प्राधान्यं वर्तते । शक्तिश्च तत्र माहेश्वरी रौद्री वा मता । सा शक्तिः सर्वव्यापिका सर्वशक्तिमती च कथिता । ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवादीनां देवतानामपि माहात्म्यमत्र वर्णितम्, येनास्य ग्रन्थस्य समन्वयात्मिका दृष्टिः सूच्यते । पुष्करे ब्राह्मसौर सम्प्रदाययोः सहावस्थानमप्यनेन पुष्करमाहात्म्याख्येन ग्रन्थेन सूच्यते ]

There are quite a good number of independent mĀhātmyas which claim to belong to the Padma-purāṇa but actually their claim holds no good and on a scrutinising analysis their independent character can be easily detected. Among these independent mĀhātmyas, however, there are a few whose importance cannot be gainsaid. Sometimes, these throw light on the hitherto unknown division and part of the Padma-purāṇa in its earlier form, present a vivid picture of the society and offer interesting information regarding the relation and attitude among different sects and sectaries. Among such independent works, *Puṣkara-māhātmya* which is known by another name *Padma purāṇa-samuccaya*<sup>1</sup> (i.e. collection of Padma-purāṇa) stands pre eminent.

We have shown elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that the Parva-division of the Padma-Purāṇa was the earlier one in comparison with the

1. Ms. No. G. 8348, Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

2. See my paper 'The Antiquity and Origin of the Padma-purāṇa and its Early Character and position in the Purāṇic Literature' published in *Our*



Khaṇḍa-division of it. It is interesting to observe that this manuscript also refers to the Parva-division of the Padma-purāṇa<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, this suggests that broadly speaking there may be two divisions of the Padma-purāṇa, 'prathama-khaṇḍa' and dvitiya-khaṇḍa.<sup>4</sup> (It is evident, here Khaṇḍa stands for 'half' and has got no connection with the Khaṇḍa-division of the Padma-purāṇa).

Thus we find that the evidence of this manuscript is not at all negligible.

A critical analysis of the manuscript will show that the śakti-worship predominates all through the work and this śakti is no other than the Śiva-śakti. Thus it will not be unwise to conclude that it is the outcome of some over-zealous propagators of the śakti-cult who, although they knew that Puṣkara was predominantly an original place for Brahmā-worshippers, utilised it with a view to popularising their sect, associating themselves with a place already regarded as divine and accepted as such by the masses. Its great devotion towards Māheśvarī-śakti can be shown from the following narrative.

In days of yore, there lived a demon named Kuku, who by the strength of his arms had vanquished the host of the gods. The latter being defeated practised penance in the Nīla mountain. They invoked 'Saṃhāra-kāriṇī raudrī mūrti' who being pleased at heart, and in order to fulfil their desired object, vehemently attacked Kuku, and at once devastated his army. Kuku by his 'māyā' brought an untimely night but her power was irresistible. She (Śiva-śakti) took no pains to kill the demon at once. All the gods assembled together and eulogised her.<sup>5</sup>

---

*Heritage* (Bulletin of the post-Graduate Research and Training Department, Sanskrit College, Calcutta), Vol. II, 1954, pp. 175-189.

3. 'पुराणं पौष्करं नाम पञ्चपर्वसमन्वितम्' Puṣkaramāhātmya, fol. 3.

4. 'इति श्रीपद्मपुराणसमुच्चये द्वितीयखण्डे सप्तविंशतितमोऽध्यायः,' Ibid, fol. 73b.

5. Fol. 18a-19b.

It reminds us of the story of Śrī-Śrī Candī; but without establishing a fundamental connection between the two, it will be unwise to infer one's influence on the other. Moreover the narrative mentioned above can not be said to be the same as that of Śrī-Śrī Candī.

The manuscript repeatedly narrates the triumphant activities of Raudrī-śakti over others. She is taken to be omnipresent and omnipotent. Through Her, all knowledge of the world had originated. As a direct reference, only two lines are quoted.

एषा ज्ञानात्मिका शक्तिर्वेदेवेदाङ्गगामिनी ।  
एषा रौद्री च वै शक्तिः शिवदूतीति वोच्यते ॥<sup>6</sup>

But, as in the case of most of the similar treatises, it also does not form an exception in embodying the glorifications of several other gods and goddesses. The compromising spirit among the different sects and sectaries which dominated the thoughts of the then-noted Indians for a considerable period, is also seen in this Māhātmya.

Although it is predominated by the śakti-worshippers as we have seen above, worship or devotion to such gods as Brahmā, Viṣṇu or Āditya is not conspicuous by its absence in it. The compromising spirit of the work can best be followed by the following simple narrative which, we will see, adheres to the worship of Brahmā and Āditya at the same time, 'Once a king on the eve of his Aśvamedha sacrifice went with his charioteer for a joy-ride. There, on his way, he came across a beautiful and heavenly lake. In the middle of the lake, there was a nice large lotus. He being pleased with the sight of the lotus, ordered his charioteer to pluck that up.

The charioteer did accordingly. But no sooner had he touched that flower, than a loud uproar (Hūmkārah) was heard, in consequence of which the charioteer fell and died instantly. The king also became devoid of strength and might, was rendered pale, and fell to the ground being turned into a

---

6. Ibid. f. 20b.

leper.<sup>7</sup> He understood that he had himself committed a grave sin; hence, in order to get rid of such pitiable condition, he approached Vaśiṣṭha who told him that that was a place of worship of Brahmā. This lotus had taken its growth from Brahmā itself. Its very sight makes one attain the result of seeing other gods. There was an image of Brahmā amidst its water. An image of the Sun-God was also found here. Vaśiṣṭha also advised him to approach Lord Brahmā in Puṣkara and propitiate Him. The king did according to the advice of the sage. In Puṣkara, he caused a jewelled image of the Sun-god to be built and worshipped Him with various rites and performances. At the end of his sacrifice, he went to Heaven in the abode of the Sun God.<sup>8</sup>

To an intelligent interpreter the above mentioned story has much narrative value. Among all other manuscripts claiming to belong to the Padma-purāṇa, this is the only one which suggests the alliance of the sects of Brahmā and Sūrya. It is a well-known fact that from time immemorial Puṣkara is associated with the holy worship of Brahmā. We have already shown how the original portion of the Padma-purāṇa, not a very small portion of which was associated with the glorification of Puṣkara, was the outcome of the efforts of the Brahmā-worshippers. In the present day, it is in Puṣkara only where the worship of Brahmā still goes on perhaps in the single temple of Brahmā in India. Thus it is obvious that Puṣkara has been

7. 'कुष्ठी विगतवर्णश्च बलवीर्यविवर्जितः' fol. 15.

8. The following lines may be compared in this connection.

एतद् ब्रह्मोद्भवं नाम पद्मं त्रैलोक्यविश्रुतम् ।  
 दृष्ट्वा जले चानेन दृष्टाः स्युः सर्वदेवताः ॥  
 एनं ( ब्रह्माणं ) दृष्ट्वा जले मग्नं संसाराद् विप्रमुच्यते ।  
 आदित्यः पद्मगतोऽस्मिन् पूर्वमेव व्यवस्थितः ।  
 इदानीमेव तं देवमाराधय महामते ॥  
 वसिष्ठवचनं श्रुत्वा राजा पुष्करमभ्यगात् ।  
 रत्नादित्यं प्रतिष्ठाप्य आराध्य त्रिविधैर्नैः ।  
 जगाम परमं स्थानं यत्र देवो दिवाकरः ॥ fol. 15

controlled and influenced by the Brahmā-sects. But at the same time Puṣkara engaged the attention of other rival sects or sectaries also. In the Purāṇas, a good number of references are not wanting which will show that from time to time the Vaiṣṇavas or the Śaivas had tried to spread their influence on this famous sacred place of the Brahmāites. This trio came into conflict some time regarding Puṣkara; but it is the Brahmāites who came out successful ultimately.

Although the Sun-worshippers (Sauras) did never rise into such prominence as the big three reached, still from the inclusion of the Sun-god in the Pañcāyatana Pūjā, the conclusion becomes irresistible that a sect was formed by some people who took Sūrya as the supreme god.

There was a difference in attitude between this sect and the three major sects. While these three were from time to time most friendly in their behaviour and only at times came into conflict, the Saura-sects were never hostile to any other. It is not difficult to understand from the above-mentioned narrative that this is the contribution of the Sun-worshippers. They, like all others, tried to associate themselves with the famous sacred place. But in doing so they not for a moment even have engaged themselves in denouncing Brahmā or the Brahmāites. Their duty was not to belittle the Brahmā-sects but to associate themselves with those sects. Hence it is told that in the same lake where there was an image of Brahmā, an image of the Sun-god was also found. Hence it has been mentioned that the king sinned against Brahmā, but was purged of all sins as he propitiated Divākara (i. e. Sun-god). These are the perfect evidences that the Saura-sects far from trying to come into a clash with the Brahmāites, tried to develop a friendly attitude towards them.

The alliance between these two sects is shown by another interesting narrative. It describes the installation of an image

of the Sun-god on the right side of the image of *Brahmā*<sup>9</sup> by a king of *Dvārāvātī*, named *Śatrujit* who received the *Syaman-taka maṇi* from *Sūrya*. It is also reported that previously, the son of *Rāvaṇa* (*Indrajit*) had established the image in *Laṅkā*.

The manuscript in its entire range is strewn with such sectarian affinity between the *Sūrya*-worshippers and *Brahmā*-worshippers. From this, the above conclusion can easily be averred.

A few words should be mentioned as regards its sociological stand-point. The *Pārvatīya brāhmaṇas* have been denounced in more places than one. They do neither deserve to be invited in the *Śrāddha* ceremonies nor have they the sanctity in administering these ceremonies.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, the Northern or Southern *brāhmaṇas* do not enjoy high position. It has been stated that those *brāhmaṇas* often commit such actions as are debarred by the *Smṛti*-authorities.<sup>11</sup> The term '*Dakṣiṇottara vipra*' can not easily be explained. Does it show superiority of the Western *brāhmaṇas* who are nearer to *Puṣkara* ?

---

9. पितामहस्य देवस्य विभागे दक्षिणे स्थिता ।

स्थापिता प्रतिमा श्रुत्वा स विप्रैस्तु प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ fol. 75a.

10. 'ये चान्ये पार्वतीयाश्च श्राद्धे नार्हन्ति केवलम् ।' fol. 93b.

11. 'गहिता धर्मशास्त्रेषु विप्राश्च दक्षिणोत्तराः ।' fol. 93b.

## प्राचीनग्रन्थेषु 'पुराण' निर्देशः

१. मुख्यैरवगृहीतं वा राजानं तत् प्रियाश्रितः ।  
इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां बोधयेदर्थशास्त्रवित् ॥  
( कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्र पृ० २६७, मैसूरसंस्करण )
२. तन्मतेन इतिहासपुराणयोरैक्यम् । मिश्रणत्ववचनाच्च वेदोपकरणत्वेन  
पुराणादीनां वेदस्वातन्त्र्यमभिहितम् ।  
( बालकीडा, याज्ञ० १।३ )
३. तत्र तूक्तं कप्वेन अथर्ववेदेतिहासपुराणानि ध्यायन् ब्राह्मेण तोर्थेन ओष्ठयोः  
सलोमप्रदेशं मृज्यात् ।  
( गो० घ० सू० १।३९, —मस्करिभाष्य )
४. पुराणं यत्र सृष्टिस्थितिसंहारा उच्यन्ते । तत् पुराणं ब्रह्माण्डादि ।  
( गो० घ० सू० ८।६ —मस्करिभाष्य )
५. पुराणमानवेतिहासव्यतिरिक्तगौतमवसिष्ठशङ्खलिखितहारीतापस्तम्बबौधायनादि-  
प्रणीतधर्मशास्त्राणां गृह्यग्रन्थानां च प्रातिशाख्यलक्षणवत् प्रतिचरणं  
पाठव्यवस्थोपलभ्यते ।  
( तन्त्रवार्त्तिक, पृ० १७९ )
६. यत् प्रथमं परिमार्ष्टि तेन अथर्ववेदम्, यद् द्वितीयं तेन इतिहासपुराणम् ।  
( बोधायनधर्मसूत्र ४।३।५ )
- ” स्कान्दमाभेयमित्यादिसमाख्यास्तु प्रवचननिबन्धनाः काठकादिवत् ।  
आनुपूर्वीनिर्माणनिबन्धना वा । तस्मात् कचिदनित्यत्वश्रवणम् तु  
आविर्भावतिरोभावापेक्षया । तदेवमितिहासपुराणयोर्वेदत्वं सिद्धम् ।  
( जीवगोस्वामिकृत-तत्त्वसन्दर्भ पृ० २८-२९,  
अच्युतग्रन्थमालासंस्करण )

७. पुराणे सुमहत् कार्यं भविष्यं हि मया श्रुतम् ।  
दृष्टं मे तपसा चैव श्रुत्वा च विदितं मम ॥ ( रामायण ४।६२।३ )
८. एतच्छ्रुत्वा रहः सूतो राजानमिदमब्रवीत् ।  
श्रूयतां तत् पुरावृत्तं पुराणे च मया श्रुतम् ॥ ( रामायण १।९।१ )
९. तथा च भगवान् पराशरः x x x  
वेदवेदाङ्गेतिहासपुराणधर्मशास्त्रावदातं शुचिं x x आचार्यम्  
( बृहत्संहिता २।२० टीकायामुद्धृतम् )  
वेदेतिहासधर्मशास्त्रकुशलं कुलीनमव्यङ्गं तपस्विनं च पुरोहितम्  
( विष्णुस्मृति ३।६७-०० )
१०. तथा गीतवादित्रोल्लापकश्लोकगाथाख्यायिकेतिहासपुराणकुशलान्  
( चरक-सूत्रस्थान १।५।७ )  
( रामशंकर भट्टाचार्य )

# THE VĀMANA PURĀṆA

BY  
V. RAGHAVAN

[अत्र वामनपुराणस्य मुद्रितामुद्रितानां पुस्तकानां परीक्षणेन स्वरूप-  
कालादिचर्चा ; कालिदासीयकाव्यच्छायासङ्क्रमः ; तथाचार्वाचीनसाहि-  
त्यांशानुप्रवेशः, पुराणान्तरसंबन्धश्च संग्रहेण विचार्यन्ते वे० राघवन्]

The Vāmana Purāṇa called for examination, as during the course of the study of Matsya Purāṇa and its problems, it was found that the Vāmana called the Matsya the foremost among the Purāṇas. While praising the best in different classes of things, the Vāmana says :

मुख्यं पुराणेषु यथैव मात्स्यम् ॥ 12. 48.

The textual problems of this comparatively short Purāṇa are not less complicated than those of the larger Purāṇas. We have the printed text of the Venkateswara Press, Bombay (1903-4), which is in 95 chapters ; it deals, of course, with the Vāmana-story, but that story is submerged in the stories of Śiva, Pārvatī and Kumāra. In this connection we may consider the manuscript-position of this Purāṇa to have a full picture of its textual problems.

The following manuscripts of the Vāmana are known from the Catalogues at my disposal for the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*<sup>1</sup> work.

## VĀMANA-PURĀṆA

Adyar I p. 155a (Chs. 1 to 66)..... (Dn pp. 269).

Alph. List. Beng. Govt. p. 104 (No. 844)

Alwar 868.

America 1447 (Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, no.  
2172).....(Śaka 1679).....(Dn. ff. 133)

Ānandāśrama 1384. 7635. 7865.

---

1. For the abbreviations of Catalogues used here, see *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, Vol. I. (Also see 'Purāṇa' Vol. I, No. 2. pp. 225ff.)



Āṇi. (Pui āṇa) 31

AS. p. 172 (inc)

B. II. 28. 30.

Bharatpur II. 48

Bhk. 13

Bhor 117

Bik. 466

BISM ptd. Cat. 1960. p. 256a (2 mss.)

BORI. 19 of 1873-74. 121 of A. 1881-82. 78 of 1882-83.

Br. Mus. 112 (sam. 1845)...(ff. 304)

**Burnell 192b. (nos. 1583-7, 11119, 11236-7)**

CPB. 5058 (Tukaram Pathak of Yeoda, Amaroti Dt.),

(The Bhonsla Rajas of  
Nagpur)

5059 do

5060 do

5061 do

5062 (Lakshmiprasad of  
Jubbulpore

Cs. IV. 196 (inc) Dn ff. 251. 199 Dn. ff. 222. 200 Dn. ff. 57

Dacca 1630 ..(Ben ff. 193). 2587 (Ben ff. 143) 3391...  
(Ben. ff. 197) 4271

Gov. Or. Libr. Madras. 83

IO. 3584...(Dn. ff. 170). 3585...(Dn. ff. 208). 3586 (3chs.  
Extract, S. Ind.) 6816 (Dn. ff. 329) 6816 (Vāmana-  
purāṇasūcikā)...Tel. pp. 28)

Jaipur Palace, Almirah 45. XLVI. 9 ; XVIII. 68.

Jodhpur 758 (Chs. 192).

К. 30

Katm. 2

Kh. 32

Kotah. 630.....(pp. 160).

L. 1264.

Mandlik BH. 44 (p. 67) ff. 190. Śaka. 1775.

MD, 2263 (Chs. 6 to 90).....(Tel. pp. 304). 2335 (purāṇa-  
tantrasūcī).....(Tel. ff. 44-52). 2336 (purāṇasūcī).....  
(Tel. ff. 125-137).

- Mysore I. p. 167 (2 mss.) C. 433 (Dn. ff. 163) 4037 (Tel. ff. 168),  
 Nabadwip 71, 72.  
 NP. V, 10.  
 Oppert II. 4923. 6952. 7739.  
 Oudh. XI, 6. XIX, 36.  
 Oudh. 1875. 8.  
 Oxf. 45 b.  
 Oxf. II. Index 1217.....(ff. 4-49) See Ms. Wilson 127 (102)  
 Bodl. Cat. pp. 45 ff.  
 Pul. II. 2065.....(Dn. ff. 175). 2066 (inc.).....(Dn. ff. 243,  
 gr. 7000), 2067 (inc.).....(Dn. ff. 195 ; gr. 6000).  
 Radh. 40.  
 Ranbir. 7896. 7932.  
 RASB. V. 3989 (Ben. ff. 167. gr. 4500). 3990 (Kashmiri. ff.  
 182. gr. 5800).  
 Serampore G-2-52.  
 S. K. Ray. 10 (inc.).....(ff. 151).  
 S. K. Ray DC. 252.....(ff. 151).  
 Skt. Coll. Ben. 1900-1910, p. 12, no. 1922 (ff. 38 gr. 1300).  
 1916-1917, p. 12, no. 2678... (ff. 27. gr. 700).  
 Sringeri Mutt. 252 (chs. 62).....(Dn.).  
 SSPC. I. F. 51. F. 157.  
 Stein. 213 (2 mss.).  
 Taylor II. p. 347 Chs. 56).  
 TD.—10+19 (Viṣṇupūjyavastukathana).....(Dn. gr. 4874).  
 10+20-3 (Viṣṇupūjyavastukathana). 10+24 (fr).....  
 (Tel. pl. gr. 900) 10+25-6 (Veṅkaṭagirimāhātmya from  
 chs. 1 to 44).  
 Tekkematham III. 9b (fr.).  
 Udaipur I. p. 138 (no. 350).....(Dn.).  
 Udaipur II. 53. 1.....(ff. 204) 53. 2 (inc.).  
 Vangiya p. 114 (inc.). (Ben. ff. 2-92, 112-173).  
 VVRI. ptd. Cat. p. 157 (nos. 1782. 1804. inc.). (Both Dn.)  
 — Kapālamocanamāhātmya from. IM. 1726.  
 — Kṛṣṇakavaca from. IM. 9787.  
 — Dadhivāmanastotra from. IM. 6930. 8344.

## BṚHAD-VĀMANA

—Kīśoramahimā from. Jaipur Palace, Almirah 38,  
NLVIII (9) (inc)

Whether the Vāmana now in print is the Mahāpurāṇa or the Upapurāṇa has been discussed<sup>1</sup>, and it has been pointed out that although some portions of the printed text may be old, it may on the whole be a later redaction, but not later than the 9th century.

While in its original form its Vaiṣṇava character was perhaps most prominent, in its present form, the Vāmana shows prominent Śaiva influence, but it must be conceded that there is no sectarian bias here towards any one deity. According to the description in the Nāradiya-purāṇa, ch. 105, the Vāmana consisted of a Pūrva and an Uttara Bhāga and the latter, in one thousand granthas, comprised four Saṁhitās—Māheśvarī devoted to Kṛishṇa, Bhāgavatī devoted to Devī, Saurī devoted to the Sun and Gaṇeśvarī devoted to Gaṇeśa. The list of topics given in the Nāradiya for the Pūrvabhāga agrees with the printed text, but the Uttarabhāga is not represented in the present text, although stories of Devī and a brief account of Gaṇeśa are part of the printed text. What is interesting is that the Nāradiya calls the Uttarabhāga *Bṛhad-Vāmana* (śl. 13—*शृणुतास्योत्तरं भागं बृहद्भामनसंज्ञकम्*). Hazra has noted in his *Studies in the Upapurāṇas* (Vol. I.)<sup>2</sup> that the Laghu-Bhāgavatāmṛta quotes six verses from the *Bṛhad-Vāmana*. Here, he takes Bṛhad-Vāmana as a separate Vaiṣṇava-upapurāṇa, distinct from a Vāmana Upapurāṇa, if such a text ever existed. But as we have seen, according to the Nāradiya, Bṛhad-Vāmana is the latter part of the Vāmana, and the Vaiṣṇava-material associated with Vāmana might belong to the first Saṁhitā of the Uttara-bhāga of Vāmana, designated Bṛhad-Vāmana.

Now in the manuscripts recorded above, there are evidences to support a text of Vāmana which once existed in two Bhāgas. In 10. 3586 (a Mackenzie manuscript), we have

three chapters (31-34) on the greatness of a shrine Tīruvoondi of Kalyāṇapurī in the South,—which includes a Varāhamāhātmya—described as part of the *Uttarabhāga* of the Vāmana. 10.6815 is a concordance of the Vāmana-contents, (a South Indian ms.), and here the *Pūrvabhāga* of the Purāṇa is referred to. In the Jaipur palace collection (Almirah 38, ms. bundle 48 (9), there is a *Kiśoramahimā* which mentions its source actually as *Brhad-Vāmana*.

In the Bikaner catalogue, we have in No 466 a manuscript of the Vāmana, and from Mitra's detailed description under this, one would be tempted to suppose that here is a manuscript of the Purāṇa in two Bhāgas. There is nothing like that. The text in this manuscript is just the same as in the printed text. The descriptive note by Mitra is wholly based on the description of the Vāmana in the Nāradiya.

Similarly the manuscripts analysed in detail in L. 1264 agrees in contents with the printed text. But a tallying of the chapters here, as well as in RASB. V. 3989, with the printed text shows that although the topics are the same in these manuscripts and the printed text, there is a different order of the chapters, as also a difference in the opening verses, in both these manuscripts as contrasted with the printed text. This difference in chapter-order, as also in the verses in the beginning, may itself be some evidence of the process of textual change from the old Vāmana to the new.

In the Sarasvatī Mahal, Tanjore, there are five Vāmana mss. (10419-23) having a portion dealing with Vaiṣṇava-worship—*Viṣṇu-pūjya-vastu-kathana* which might go the older version.

In the same Library, there are three mss. containing a Veṅkaṭagirimāhātmya (11424-6), described as part of the Vāmana; this ascription too may be explained by the Vaiṣṇava-character of the earlier version or at least of the *Uttarabhāga* which had a specific section devoted to Kṛiṣṇa.

One may not agree with every argument advanced by H. P. Sastri<sup>1</sup> to show the early date of the Vāmana, but the Purāṇa does have an older air about it, not found in the later redactions of the other Purāṇas. Also we can accept that, as it is, the text was produced in Kurukṣetra region, for in a series of verses praising the best of each class, already referred to, the Vāmana speaks of Kurukṣetra and its Tīrthas like Piithūdaka as the most sacred. (ch. 12, śls. 44-57):

क्षेत्रेषु यद्वत्कुर्वाङ्गलं वरं  
तीर्थेषु यद्वत् प्रवरं पृथ्वकम् । 45.

The Vāmana text, as at present available, shows a considerable amount of literary polish, and the influence on it of Kālidāsa<sup>2</sup> in particular is patent.

*Vāmana.*

*K. S.*

51.38 : न युक्तं चैवमुक्तवाथ  
सगणोऽन्तर्दधे ततः ।

III. 74 :  
अन्तर्दधे भूतपतिः समुतः ॥

„ 58 : तपसा वाञ्छयन्तीह  
गिरिजे सचराचराः ।  
रूपाभिजनमैश्वर्य-  
मेतत्ते वर्तते बहु ॥

V. 41. कुले प्रसूतिः प्रथमस्य वेधसः  
त्रिलोकसौन्दर्यमिवोदितं वयः ।  
अमृग्यमैश्वर्यं सुखं नवं वयः  
तपः फलं स्यात् किमतः परं वद ॥

„ 59 तत्किमर्थमपास्यैतान्  
अशङ्करान् जटा धृताः ।

V. 44. किमित्यपास्याभरणानि यौवने  
धृतं त्वया वार्धकशोभि वल्कलम् ।

In the further conversation between Śiva in the form of the Vāṇu, the metre too approximates to that of the K. S.

51.63 : कथं करः पल्लवक्रोमलस्ते  
समेष्यते शार्वकरं ससर्पम् ।

V. 66. अवस्तुनिर्बन्धपरे कथं नु ते  
करोऽयमाप्तविवाहकौतुकः ।  
करेण शम्भोर्वल्लयीकृताहिना  
सहिष्यते तत्प्रथमावलम्बनम् ॥

1. ASB. Oat. V. Introduction, pp. 181-4.

2. On Kālidāsa's influence on some other Purāṇas, see my 'The Kālikā Purāṇa, Kālidāsa and Māgha', Woolner Com. Vol. pp. 191-4, and 'Gleanings from the Matsya Purāṇa', Purāṇa, Vol. I. p. 86. and 'Further Gleanings', *ibid.*, Vol. III. No. 2.

- 64 : तथा दुकूलाम्बरशालिनी त्वं 57 : वधूदुकूलं कलहंसलक्षणं  
मुगारिचर्मभिर्वृतस्तु रुद्रः । गजार्जिनं शोणितबिन्दुवर्णि च ।  
,, त्वं चन्द्रनाक्ता स च भस्म भू (रू)षितः 69 : स्तनद्वयेऽस्मिन् हरिवन्दनात्पदं  
पदं चिताभस्मरजः करिष्यति ।  
,, न युक्तरूपं प्रतिभाति मे त्विदम् 69 : अयुक्तरूपं किमतः परं वद ।  
65 : एवं वादिनि विप्रेन्द्रे VI. 84 : एवं वादिनि देवर्षे

Pārvatī's reply—

- 66 : शिवो वाप्यथवा भीमः V. 77 : न भीमरूपः शिव इत्युदीर्यते  
सधनो निर्धनोऽपि वा । ,, ,, अकिञ्चनस्सन् प्रभवः स संपदाम्  
अलंकृतो वा देवेशः ,, ,, विभूषणोद्भासि पिनद्धभोगि वा  
तथा वाप्यनलङ्कृतः ,, 83 : निवार्यतामालि किमप्यथ वदः  
,, 67 : निवार्यतामये भिक्षुः पुनर्विबधुः स्फुरितोत्तराधरः ।  
विबधुः स्फुरिताधरः । ,, ,, न केवलं यो महतोऽपभापते  
न तथा निन्दकः पापी ,, ,, शृणोति तस्मादपि यः स पापभाक् ।  
यथा श्रोता— II  
,, 68 : ततोऽत्यजद् भिक्षुरूपं ,, 84 : स्वरूपमास्थाय च तां कृतस्मिन्  
स्वरूपस्थोऽभवच्छिवः ।

Ch. 52 Marriage.

- Śl. 1 : ततः संपूजितो रुद्रः VI. 3 : श्रुष्वीन् ज्योतिर्भवाद् सप्त  
सस्मार स्मरशासनः ।  
सस्मार च महर्षीस्तु 4 : सारुधतोकाः सपदि  
अरुन्धत्या समं ततः II प्रादुरासन् पुरः प्रभोः ।  
,, 11 : तां मवर्थाय शैलेन्द्रो 29 : तामस्मदर्थे युष्माभिः  
याच्यतां द्विजसत्तमाः । याचितव्यो हिमालयः ।  
13. Śiva to Arundhati

- पुरन्ध्रयो हि पुरन्ध्रीणां 32 : प्रायेणैवं विवे कार्ये  
गीतं धर्मस्य वै विदुः । पुरन्ध्रीणां प्रगल्भता ।  
cf. also 13 :  
क्रियाणां खलु धर्म्याणां  
सत्पत्न्यो मूलकारणम् ।

- 2 : Himavān to the sages : 54 :  
अनघवृष्टिः किमियम्

अपमेधोदयं वर्षम्

- उत्ताहोऽकुसुमं फलम् ।  
 अमृतवर्यमचिन्त्यं च  
 भवदागमनं त्विवम् ॥
- 28 : दृष्टिपूर्तं पदाक्रान्तं  
 तीर्थं सारस्वतं यथा ।
- 29, 30 : दासोऽहं भवतां विप्राः ।  
 किंकरोऽस्मि—  
 स्थितो युष्मदाज्ञाकारी तदुच्यताम् ।  
 सदारोऽहं समं पुत्रैः ।
- 31 : ऊचुरङ्गिरसं वृद्धं  
 कार्यमद्रौ निवेदय ।
- 39 : यावन्तो जङ्गमा गम्या  
 भूताः शैल चतुर्विधाः ।  
 तेषां माता त्वयि देवी  
 यतः प्रोक्तः पिता हरः ॥
- 41 : याचितारो वयं शर्वो  
 वरो दाता त्वमप्युमा ।  
 वधूः सर्वजन्माता  
 कुरु यच्छ्रेयसे तव ॥
- 59 : ततोऽप्यरुन्धती काली-  
मङ्कमारोप्य चाटुकैः ।  
विलज्जमानामाशवास्य  
हरनामोचितैः शुभैः ॥
- 60 : जामित्रशुणसंयुक्तां  
 तिथिं पुरयां सुमङ्गलाम् ।
- 61 : उत्तराफल्गुनी योगं  
 मृतीयेऽङ्गि हिमांशुमान् ।  
 गमिष्यति च तत्रोक्तो  
 मुहूर्तो मैत्रनामकः ॥
- Ch. 53. śl. 11 : यमुना सरितां श्रेष्ठा  
 बालव्यजनमुत्तमम् ।
- अदृष्टकुसुमं फलम् ।  
 अतर्कितोपपन्नं वो  
 दर्शनं प्रतिभाति मे ॥
- 56 : यदव्यासितमर्हद्भिः  
 तद्धि तीर्थं प्रचक्षते ।
- 58 : जङ्गमं प्रेष्यभावे वः ।
- 62 : आज्ञां मे दातुमर्हथ ।
- 63 : एते वयममी दाराः  
 कन्येयं कुलजीवितम् ।  
 ब्रूत येनात्र वः कार्यम् ।
- 65 : अथाङ्गिरसमग्रण्यं × ×  
 ऋषयो नोदयामासुः ।
- 80 : यावन्त्येतानि भूतानि  
 स्थावराणि चराणि च ।  
मातरं कल्पयन्त्वेनाम्  
ईशो हि जगतः पिता ॥
- 82 : उमा वधूभवान् दाता  
 याचितार इमे वयम् ।  
 वरः शम्भुरलं ह्येष  
 त्वत्कुलोद्भूतये विधिः ॥
- 91 : तां प्रणामादर × ×  
अङ्कमारोपयामास  
लज्जमानामरुन्धती ॥
- VII. 1 : तिथौ तु जामित्रशुणान्वितायाम् ।
- 6 : मैत्रे मुहूर्ते शशलावच्छनेन  
 योगं गतासुत्तरफल्गुनीषु ।
- VI. 93 : वैवाहिकीं तिथिं वृष्टाः  
 ते त्र्यहादूर्ध्वमाख्याय
- VII. 42 : मूर्ते च गङ्गायमुने तदानीं  
 सन्नामरे देवमसेविषाताम् ।

23. The acts of the city-ladies  
on seeing Śiva coming :

जीमूतकेतुरायात  
इत्येवं नगरस्थियः ।  
निजकर्म परित्यज्य  
दर्शनायादृता भवन् ॥

53 : तस्मिन् मुहूर्ते पुरमुत्तरीणा-  
मीशानसंदर्शनलालसानाम् ।  
प्रासादमालासु बभूवुरित्यं  
त्यक्तान्यकार्याणि विचोदितानि ॥

24 : माल्यदाम समादाय  
करेणैकेन मामिती ।  
केशपाशं द्वितीयेन  
शङ्कराभिमुखी गता ॥

57 : × × ×  
कयाचिदुद्वेष्टनवान्तमाल्यः ।  
बद्धुं न सम्भावित एव तावत्  
करेण रुद्धोऽपि च केशपाशः ॥

25 : अन्यालक्तकरागाढ्यं  
पादं कृत्वाकुलेक्षणा ।  
अनलक्तकमेकं हि  
× ×

Cf. 58 : × × अप्रपाद-  
माक्षिप्य काचिद् द्रव्यमग्रेव  
etc.

26 : एकेनाक्षणाजितेनैव  
श्रुत्वा भीममुपागतम् ।  
साज्जनां च प्रगृह्यान्या  
शलाकां सुष्ठु धावति ॥

59 : विलोचनं दक्षिणमङ्गेन  
संभाव्य तद्वञ्चितवामनेन ।  
तथैव वातायनसन्निकर्षं  
ययौ शलाकामपरा वहन्ती ॥

27 : अन्या सरसनं वासः  
पाणिनादाय सुन्दरी ।

60 : × अन्या प्रस्थानमिक्षा न  
बबन्ध नीवीम् ।  
× हस्तेन तस्थौ श्रव-  
लम्ब्य वासः ॥

30 : × × अबला ब्रुवन्ति ।  
स्थाने तपो दुश्चरमम्बिकायाः

65 : स्थाने तपो दुश्चरमेतदर्थ-  
मपर्वया पेलवयापि तप्तम् ।

Towards the end, in the chapters dealing with Vāmana-  
avatāra story, the Vāmanapurāṇa devotes a chapter (94th) to  
a conversation between Bali and Prahlāda and the latter  
speaking to the former on the greatness of devotion to Hari.  
Here almost the first verse in Prahlāda's teaching—'भवजलधिगतानां  
द्वन्द्ववाताहतानाम् सुतदुहिषुकलवज्राणभारादितानाम् । विषयविषमतीये मञ्जतामस्रवानां  
भवति शरणमेको विष्णुपीतो नराणाम् ॥' is identical with verse 11 of the  
famous hymn Mukundamālā of Kulaśekhara. Verse 31 स्वपुष्प-  
मभिवीक्ष्य पराहस्तं here is Visnu Purāṇa III. 7. 14.



# ON SOME READINGS OF THE MATSYA-PURĀṆA\*

BY

NILMADHAV SEN

[ लेखकमहोदयेनात्र निबन्धे आनन्दाश्रममुद्रितमत्स्यपुराणपुस्तके वर्त्तमानान् कांश्चिदशुद्धपाठान् समालोच्य तेषां स्थाने शुद्धपाठाः सप्रमाणमुपन्यस्ताः । तद्यथा—२०८।१० श्लोके अश्वपते राज्ञः पत्नी 'मालती' इति कथिता, २१३।१६ श्लोके तु 'मालवी' इति । महा-भारतेऽपि 'मालवी' पाठ एव । अतो देशनामानुसारेण वैदेही-मैथिलीवत् अत्रापि 'मालवी' पाठ एव शुद्धो मन्तव्यः । २५४।११ श्लोके 'यद्विशालकं' इत्यत्र 'यद्विशालकं' इति पाठः शुद्धः, यतः चतुःशाल-त्रिशाल-द्विशालादिनिर्माणस्यैवान्न प्रकरणं वर्त्तते; 'विशालश्च' पुनः २७०।११ श्लोके वर्णितः अष्टत्रिशत्स्तम्भात्मको मण्डपविशेषः 'द्विशाल' गृहाद् भिन्न एव । तत्रापि (२७०।११) श्लोके 'चत्वारिंशद् यज्ञभद्र-स्तद्विहीनो विशालकः' इति पाठे 'तद्विहीनो विशालकः' इति पाठो युक्तः । एवमेव 'ब्रह्मभागाधिका' (२६५।५) स्थाने 'ब्रह्मभागाभिधा', 'परिवारितः' (२६६।४१) स्थाने 'परिवारतः', 'चन्द्रशालो विभूषितः' (२६६।४०) स्थाने 'चन्द्रशाला-विभूषितः' तथा 'मनोर्मनुश्च', 'नरोषा नोच', चित्तहार्योऽयनश्चैत्र (२०३।११-१२) पाठानां स्थाने 'मनो मनुश्च' 'नरोषानश्च' ( 'नरोषाणौ' वा ) 'चित्तिहंयो नयश्चैध' इति शुद्धाः पाठाः प्रस्तुताः, वायुपुराणेऽपि द्वादश सिद्धास्तथैव नाम्ना निर्दिष्टाः—इति हेतुश्चात्रोपन्यस्तः । एवमन्येऽपि कतिचिद् अष्टाः पाठाः समालोचिताः संशोधिताश्च । ]

[Bibliographical Note : The following editions of the Matsya-Purāṇa (MP) have been consulted for this paper :—

1. The Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series (ASS) edition.
  2. The Lakṣmī-Veṅkaṭeśvara Press (LVP) edition.
  3. The Baṅgabāsi Press Edition in Bengali characters (Bl.)
- References have been given to the ASS edition.]

---

\* Paper submitted to the 21st Session of the All-India Oriental Conference held in Srinagar in October, 1961, and published with the kind permission of the General President of the Session.

The Purāṇas are rightly regarded to be of inestimable value for the social, religious and cultural study of early medieval India and popular Hinduism, and their overall importance is next only to that of the Vedas and the two great epics, the Mahābhārata (Mbh.) and the Rāmāyaṇa (Rām.). But whereas the critical edition (cr. ed.) of the Mbh. is almost nearing completion and that of the First Book of the Rām. has already been published, it is not yet known when the cr. ed. of any of the major Purāṇas will see the light of publication. All the editions of the various Purāṇas published so far require corrections and emendations in almost every page. An attempt will be made here to suggest emendations for a few out of the innumerable wrong readings (w.r.) of the Matsya-Purāṇa.

The name of the wife of King Aśvapati is given as Mālatī at 208.10 (*mālatī nāma tasyā id rājñah pañc pativratā*) and as Mālavī at 213.16 (*mālavāyaṃ mālavā nāma śāśvatāḥ putra-puṭrīṇaḥ*). As the descendants of King Aśvapati and his wife became known as Mālavas after their mother, it is evident that Mālatī at 208.10 is a w. r. for Mālavī, unless we are to assume that the personal name of the queen was Mālatī and the name Mālavī was derived from the supposed country of her birth (cf. Vaidehī or Maithilī besides Sītā). But as the two names are too closely similar to each other it seems that Mālatī is really a w. r. for Mālavī. Moreover, the Sāvitrīupākhyāna of the Mbh. also reads Mālavī here.\*

Chapter 25† of the MP describes the Catuṣśālas, Trisālas, Dviśālas and Ekaśālas. But at 25.11 the reading as found in the printed texts is: *dhanaśhyam pūrva-yāmyābhyāṃ śālāśhyam yad viśalakam tac chastra-bhayaḥ nṛṇāṃ parābhava-bhayaṇam*. The correct reading here should be *yad dviśalakam* for *yad viśalakam*. *Yad dviśala*° can easily become *yad viśala*° through a slight scribal error. The architectonic term Dviśāla actually

---

\* It may incidentally be pointed out here that the v. l. Mānavī (for Mālavī) recorded in the cr. ed. of the Mbh. for the Bengali recension seems to be due to an incorrect reading of the Bengali MSS. The letters *n* and *l* look almost alike in the Bengali MSS. written roughly before the middle of the 18th century A. D. and the confusion persists even in later MSS.

occurs at 153. 51d (*caturṣālaṃ trīśālaṃ ca dvīśālaṃ cuiḥśālakam*). Similarly, *yad viśālaṃ* at 254.6 should probably be *yat trīśālaṃ*, as in verse no. 4 of the same chapter. It may be mentioned here that *viśāla*(ka) is a completely different architectonic term and means 'a pavilion with 38 columns'. Cf. 270. 11 *caturārimśad yajñabhadras tad dvihīno* (here also the printed texts read *tad vihīno*. See infra) *viśālakah*.

The reading *siddhārtha-raja-rajyāni viśālāni sadā budhaiḥ* at 254. 14ab is meaningless. It should evidently read as *siddhārtaharajam varjyāni dvīśālāni sadā budhaiḥ*. Verses 254. 8-9 describe this type of building without recording the name there. But this description tallies with that of Siddhārtha as given in the *Bṛhatsamhitā*, 53. 39. Except Siddhārtha, all other varieties of Dvīśāla buildings are regarded as inauspicious.

*Dūtī-karmātakādīnāṃ vakṣye bhavana-pañcakam* at 254. 24 should be *dūtī-karmāntikādīnāṃ* etc., a reading which is actually found in the LVP and some other editions and shown as v. l. in the foot note of the ASS edition. It is rather strange that the editors of the ASS edition rejected the correct reading.

At 257. 10cd the meaningless reading *ekaikaśiśapā dhanyā śrīparṇā tīndukā talhā* should be *ekaiva śiśapā* etc., as actually found in the LVP and Bl. editions.

At 264. 21cd the reading *patākā jaladākārā madhye syān maṇḍapasya tu* should probably be emended to *patākā jvaladākārā* etc., because a coloured flag fluttering in the wind more resembles the flame of fire quivering in the breeze than a speck of cloud floating in the sky.

In the verse *adlaḥ kūrmasilā proktā sadā brahmasilāūlīkā upary avasthitā tasya brahmabhāgyādīkā silā* at 265. 5, the reading *brahmabhāgyādīkā* should probably have to be emended to *brahmabhāgyābhīkā* 'known as Brahmabhāga'. The confusion, if any, seems to be due to the word *brahmasilādīkā* 'larger than the Brahmaśilā' of the previous line.

In the verse *sthāpayet yam tu devesāṃ tam pradhānam prakāpayet tasya pārśvassthītān anyān samsāret parivāritāḥ* at 266. 41

the meaningless reading *parivāritaḥ* should be emended to *parivārataḥ* 'in the order of the attending gods have been placed'.

The readings *tad vihīna°* / *tad vihīnaka°* at 270. 9; 10; 11, etc. should be *tad dvihīna°* / *tad dvihīnaka°*. *Dvihīna°* is actually found in these very passages where it is not preceded by *tad* (cf. *yad viśāla°* for *yad dvīśāla°* discussed above).

The text *mṛgarājas tu viśhyātaś candraśālo vibhūṣitaḥ* at 269. 40ab should be.....*candraśālā-vibhūṣitaḥ*. Similarly, *anekaś candraśālaś ca gajaḥ prāsāda isyate* at 269. 41ab should be *aneka-candraśālaś ca* etc.

At 203. 11-12 the verses giving the names of the 12 Sādhyas read as follows :

*manor manuś* (v. l. *mānaś*) *ca prāṇaś ca naraś noca* (sic !)  
*vīryavān*

*cittahāryo' yanaś caiva haṁso nārāyaṇas tathā*

*vibhuś cāpi prabhuś caiva sādhyā dvādaśa kṛtitaḥ*

These verses contain so many wrong readings and have so many variants and the names are given so differently in the different Purāṇas that it is quite difficult to suggest a full-proof emendation here. Be that as it may, I would like to suggest the reading *mano manuś* (*mānaś*) *ca prāṇaś ca nara' pānaś ca vīryavān* for the first line.\* *Mana* occurs in the list of the Sādhyas as given in the Vāyu-Purāṇa, 66. 15, and the reading *nara' pānaś ca vīryavān* is found in many MSS. of the Vāyu-Purāṇa. *Cittahāryo' yanas caiva* of the second line should probably have to be emended to *cittir hayo nayaś caiva*, as in the Vāyu-Purāṇa.

---

\* Or, *naraś noca* may also be a w. r. for *naraś noca*. In that case Uṣan would correspond to Vṛṣa of the Harivaṃśa-list of the Sādhyas.

# THE LEGEND OF CIRAKĀRIN IN THE SKANDA MAHĀPURĀṆA AND THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

(A COMPARATIVE STUDY)

BY

V. M. BEDEKAR

[ स्कन्दपुराणे माहेश्वरखण्डान्तर्गतकौमारखण्डस्य षष्ठेऽध्याये  
महाभारते च मोक्षधर्मपर्वणि ३५८ अध्याये चिरकारिकोपाख्यानं वर्तते ।  
चिरकारी नाम मेधातिथेर्गौतमस्य पुत्र आसीत् । स स्वभावादेव  
विमृश्यकारित्वाचिरकारीति नाम्ना प्रसिद्धो बभूव । स्कन्दपुराणा-  
नुसारेण तस्य माता कौशिकीतीरे बलि राजानमीक्षितवती । अस्माद्  
व्यभिचारान्धेतोश्चिरकारी स्वमातुर्वधाय गौतमेनादिष्टः, मातुर्वधं  
स्वीकृत्यापि स्वभावादेव चिरं विमृश्यकारित्वात् मातुर्वधे दोषान्  
विमृशन् मातुश्च महान्तं गौरवं विचारयन्नेव चिरमपिष्ठत् । एतस्मिन्नन्तरे  
ब्राह्मणवेषधारिणा शक्नेन गौतमः स्त्रीणामपराधः उपेक्षणीय इत्युपदिष्टः ।  
गौतमोऽपि स्वपत्न्या वधो नैच्छत् । अतः स चिरकारिणं विमृशन्तं  
स्वपत्नीं च जीवन्तीमेव दृष्ट्वा परं सुखी बभूव । महाभारते गौतमपत्नी  
गौतमवेषधारिणेन्द्रेण सह व्यभिचारं चरितवत्यपि चिरकारिणा गौतमेन  
चोभास्यामेव सा निरपराधा मता । अत्र स्कन्दपुराणे  
चिरकारिकोपाख्यानस्य जमदग्नि-रेणुका-परशुरामोपाख्यानं मूलं, महाभारते  
च गौतम-अहल्या-इन्द्रोपाख्यानं जमदग्नि-परशुरामोपाख्यानं चोभयमेव  
मूलम् । इत्यादिरूपेणास्मिन्नित्येव लेखकमहोदयेन तुलनात्मकदृष्ट्याऽ  
तीवोपयोगी विमर्शः प्रस्तुतः, द्विविधमिदमाख्यानमाश्रित्य च तदानीन्तनस्य  
लोकस्य स्त्रीणां विषये का दृष्टिर्बभूवेत्यादिविषयोऽपि समालोचितः । ]

There are many legends which are common to the Mahā-  
bhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Purāṇas and other old Sanskrit  
works. Though many of these legends, appearing in common  
in these works, seem to be broadly identical, they are likely  
to show, on a closer comparative study, significant difference  
in details indicative of the different versions handed down  
by different old traditions. Though the general frame-work  
of the story and persons appearing in it may be identical in  
these several works, there may be found from work to work

a new adaptation and orientation given to the drift of the original story and to the characterization of persons figuring in it, indicative of the change in the temper and outlook of the society in which the story was retold.

It is proposed, in this article, to make a comparative study of the legend of *Cirakārin* from this point of view.

The story of *Cirukārin* ('one who acts late' i.e. one who reflects long before doing anything) occurs in two works—the *Skānda Mahāpurāṇa* (SK) and the *Mahābhārata* (Mbh.). The story is significant from many points of view; it also differs in many important details in the two works. Before we mark the points of difference in the presentation of the story in these two works and its significance, we shall first present the story in accordance with its version occurring in the SK.

The story of *Cirakārin* is found in SK. 1. 2. 6. i.e. in the 6th adhyāya of the Kaumāra-khaṇḍa of the Māheśvara-Khaṇḍa of the Skāndamahāpurāṇa. Nārada<sup>1</sup> is desirous of settling a colony of Brāhmaṇas in a holy place called *Stambha-tīrtha* which is said to be situated 'at the meeting-place of the earth and the sea' (महीसागरसंगमे). He wanted to make a free religious gift of that holy place to the Brāhmaṇas. He, therefore, took with him twenty-six thousand Brāhmaṇas belonging to Kalāpa and other adjoining villages in the north to the *Stambha-tīrtha* on the sea-coast in the South. The leader of those Brāhmaṇas was Hārīta who readily accepted Nārada's offer to go and settle in the *Stambha-tīrtha*.<sup>2</sup> Nārada

<sup>1</sup> अहं हि ब्रह्मणो वाक्याद्विप्राणां स्थानकं शुभम् ।

वातुकामो महातीर्थे महीसागरसंगमे ॥ 9 ॥

—SK. 1. 2. 6.

(Venkatesvara Press edition, Bombay)

<sup>2</sup> Hārīta Says :

कलापादिषु ग्रामेषु को वसेत् विचक्षणः ।

यदि वासः स्तम्भतीर्थे क्षणार्धमपि लभ्यते ॥ 24 ॥

.....

arrived at the *Stambhātārtha* with the host of the Brāhmaṇas and proceeded to wash the feet of the Brāhmaṇas as a preparation previous to the announcement of his proposed gift, when there arrived on the scene a sage named Kapila. Nārada treated this distinguished guest with great hospitality and gave over to him, according to the latter's desire, eight thousand Brāhmaṇas from among the Brāhmaṇa inhabitants of Kalāpa, with a piece of land at the *Stambhātārtha*, announcing that this small colony would be called the कपिलं स्थानं.<sup>1</sup>—Then Nārada with a view to carrying out his original proposal of giving away in charity the gift of the *Stambhātārtha* to the Brāhmaṇas, invited their leader Hārīta to accept at his hands the 'washing of feet'. Accordingly Hārīta came forward and stood, bringing his left foot in front to be washed, instead of his right foot. At this fault of Hārīta, the sages, the celestial damsels and the gods who had assembled there, burst into a laughter of ridicule. Nārada was offended and he cursed Hārīta and his Brāhmaṇa followers that they would be block-

षड्विंशतिसहस्राणि ब्राह्मणा मे परिग्रहं ।

षट्कर्मनिरताः शुद्धा लोभदम्भविवर्जिताः ॥ 27 ॥

तैः सार्धमागमिष्यामि ममेदं मतमुत्तमम् ।

..... ॥ 28 ॥

SK. ibid

1 नारदः—

धन्योऽहं यदिहायात. कपिल त्वं महामुने ।

नास्त्यदेयं तत्रास्माभिः पात्रं नास्ति तत्राधिकम् ॥ 53 ॥

कपिल उवाच —

अष्टौ विप्रसहस्राणि मम देहीति नारद ॥ 57 ॥

भूमिदानं करिष्यामि कलापग्रामवासिनाम् ।

ब्राह्मणानामहं तेषां तद्विदं क्रियतां विभो ॥ 58 ॥

नारद. —

तत्ते मया प्रतिज्ञातमेवमस्तु महामुने ।

त्वयापि क्रियतां स्थानं कपिलं कपिलोत्तमम् ॥ 60 ॥

SK. ib.

heads and reduced to penury.<sup>1</sup> Hārīta retorted: "Oh sage, it is you who stand to lose by cursing us thus. I committed this fault in a fit of absent-mindedness. Hear why I was absent-minded. I was all the while thinking hard in my mind about accepting your gift. The acceptance of gift is very painful for a Brāhmaṇa, because the acceptance of gift diminishes his spiritual power. That is why you should not be angry with me for a fault which I committed in a fit of absent-mindedness."<sup>2</sup> At this explanation of Hārīta, Nārada was stung with repentance for his hasty pronouncement of the curse and openly blamed himself in the presence of the Brāhmaṇas for his foolish rashness. He said: 'One should not do actions rashly. Rash action is the abode of calamities. All the goods and riches of life come to a wise man who does things only after

1 ततो महामुनिः श्रीमान् हारीतो ह्वयितस्तदा ॥ 6. ॥

पादप्रक्षालनार्थाय सिद्धदेवसमागमे ।

हारीतश्च पुरस्कृत्य वामपादं तथा स्थितः ॥ 63 ॥

ततो हासो महाञ्जने सिद्धाप्सरःसुपर्वणाम् ।

----- ॥ 64 ॥

ततो ममापि मनसि शोकवेगो महानभूत् ।

----- ॥ 65 ॥

ततोऽहमन्नवं विप्रान् यूयं मूर्खा भविष्यथ ।

धनधान्याल्पसंयुक्ता दारिद्र्यकललावृताः ॥ 67 ॥

8K. ibid.

2 एवमुक्ते प्रहस्यैव हारीतः प्राब्रवीद्विदम् ।

तवैवेयं पुने हानिर्यदस्माच्छ्रपते भवान् ॥ 68 ॥

मृग्यु तत्कारणं धीमच्छून्यता मे यतो भवेत् ॥ 71 ॥

इति चिन्तयतश्चित्ते हा दुःखोऽयं प्रतिग्रहः ।

प्रतिग्रहेण विप्राणां ब्राह्मणं तेजो हि शाम्यति ॥ 72 ॥

इति चिन्तयतो ममं शून्यताभूद्धि नारद ।

----- ॥ 75 ॥

तदेषु मतिमान् कोपं न कुर्वीत----- ॥ 76 ॥

—8K. ib.



reflection.<sup>1</sup> In this context, Nārada remembered the old story of Cirakārin and told it to the Brāhmaṇas. The following is the close summary of the story as Nārada told it to the Brāhmaṇas (SK. ib. 80—131).

Gautama had a son named *Cirakārin* (C.). He was very intelligent. He did all actions after long reflection. He was called C. because he reflected long before doing anything. People, who had small minds and could not see far, called him an idler and a fool.<sup>2</sup>

Once his father was angry with his wife (C.'s mother) for some moral transgression (*vyabhicāra*) on her part. Leaving aside all other sons, the father asked C. to kill his mother. C., according to his wont, said 'Yes' after a long time. Then he thought long : "Oh ! shall I sink down like a wretch under this dilemma and quandary of duties. To obey the father's command is the highest duty. Still who can hope to be happy after having killed a woman and a mother ?"<sup>3</sup>

1 तान्विप्रान्नत्रवं पुनः ।

धिङ् मामस्तु च दुर्बुद्धिमविमृशयार्थकारिणम् ॥ 78 ॥

सहस्रं न क्रियां कुर्यात्पदमेतन्महापदम् ।

विमृश्यकारिणं वीरं वृणते सर्वसंपदः ॥ 79 ॥

—SK. ib.

2 चिरकारी महाप्राज्ञो गौतमस्याभवत्सुतः ।

चिरकार्याभिसंपत्तेश्चिरकारी तथोच्यते ।

अलसमहर्षं प्राप्नो दुर्मेधावी तथोच्यते ॥

बुद्धिलाघवयुक्तेन जनेनादीर्घदर्शिना । 81—83 ॥

—SK. ib.

3. व्यभिचारेण कस्मिन् स व्यतिक्रम्यापरान् सुतान् ।

पित्रोक्तः कुपितेनाथ जह्नीमां जननीमिति ।

स तथेति चिरेणोक्तः स्वभावाच्चिरकारकः ॥

विमृश्य चिरकारित्वाञ्जितयाप्राप्तं वै चिरम् ।

कथं धर्मच्छलेनास्मिन्निमज्ज्येयमसाधुवत् ।

पितुराज्ञा परो धर्मः.....

स्त्रियं हत्वा मातरं च को हि जातु सुखी भवेत् ॥ 82-87 ॥

SK. ib.

Then C. thought of arguments in favour of the claims of the father : One who disregards one's father is not an honourable man. The father bodies forth his own self in his son. One owes one's body to the father, When father is pleased, all gods are pleased. If the father approves, one gets free from all sins, as a flower or fruit gets free from its stem, So the father occupies a big place in our mind. But then let me think of my mother."<sup>1</sup>

And C. thinks of arguments in favour of his mother and sings of the glory of having a mother : "This assembly of five elements in me is due to my mother as the birth of the fire is due to the fire-stick. In the presence of the mother, one is not affected by grief or old age.<sup>2</sup> Even a poor man, when he comes home and calls 'mother'—even if he be hundred years old, he behaves like a baby of two years. The whole world becomes a void in the absence of mother. There is no shady shelter, refuge or protection or watering place like the mother. She is धात्री because she sustains her baby in the womb, जननी because she gives birth, अम्बा because she nourishes the limbs, वीरसू because she produces a वीर, श्वश्रू because she attends to and nurses her baby and माता because she thinks

- 
1. पितरं चाप्यवज्ञाय कः प्रतिष्ठामवाप्नुयात् ।  
 पिता ह्यात्मानमाधत्ते जायायां जज्ञिवानिति ॥  
 सोऽहमात्मा स्वयं पित्रा पुत्रत्वे परिकल्पितः ।  
 शरीरादीनि देयानि पिता ह्येकः प्रयच्छति ।  
 तस्मात्पितुर्वचः कार्यं न विचार्य कथंचन ॥  
 निष्कृतिः सर्वपापानां पिता यदभिनन्दति ।  
 मुच्यते बन्धनात्पुष्पं फलं वृस्तान्प्रमुच्यते ॥  
 पिता नात्यन्तरं स्थानं चित्तिष्यामि मातरम् । 82-27 ।

SK. ib.

2. यो ह्ययं मयि संघातो मर्त्यत्वे पांचभौतिकः ॥  
 अस्य मे जननी हेतुः पावकस्य यथारणिः ।  
 मातुलाभे सनाथत्वमनाथत्वं विपर्यये ।  
 न स शोचति नाप्येनं स्थावर्यमपकर्षति ॥ 97-99 ॥

SK. ib.

highly of her child."<sup>1</sup> Then at last, C. concludes that the mother is worth more than the whole world of men and gods and that, therefore, though other elders fallen from virtue may be abandoned, the mother though fallen from virtue should never be forsaken as she is greater than all others on account of her bearing the foetus and nourishing it.<sup>2</sup>

The father of C. had seen his wife staring, according to the nature of women, at King Bali on the bank of the river Kauśikī and had therefore asked his son to kill her. After having given the order, the father was uneasy and thought for a long time and could not overcome his uneasiness.<sup>3</sup> While he was brooding over the matter, there arrived, at his hermitage, Indra in the guise of a Brāhmaṇa. He cited to the father of C. certain old verses (गाथा) which meant: "False and frail

- 
1. श्रिया हीनोऽपि यो गेहे भवेति प्रतिपद्यते ।  
 अपि वर्षशतस्यान्ते स द्विहायनवच्चरेत् ।  
 तदा शून्यं जगत्तस्य यदा माता विप्रुज्यते ।  
 नास्ति मातुसमा छाया नास्ति मातुसमा गतिः ।  
 नास्ति मातुसमं त्राणं नास्ति मातुसमा प्रपा ।  
 कुक्षिसंधारणाद्धात्री जननाब्जननी तथा ॥  
 अङ्गानां वर्धनादम्बा वीरसुखे च वीरसुः ।  
 शिशोः शुश्रूषणाच्छ्वश्रूमति स्यान्माननात्तथा ॥ 100-105 ॥  
 SK. ib.

Up to this point, the Mbh. version of the story of C. is almost common. But at this point, there intervenes in the Mbh. a passage of about 16 lines which, in effect, exculpates the mother, even though she is guilty of sexual infidelity. We shall summarize this passage in the sequel of this article when we deal with the differences which the Mbh. has from the SK.

- 2 मर्त्यानां देवतानां च पूगो नात्येति मातरम् ॥  
 पतिता गुरवस्त्याज्या माता च न कथंचन ।  
 गर्भधारणपोषाभ्यां तेन माता गरीयसी ॥ 106-107 ॥  
 SK. ib.
- 3 एवं स कौशिकीतीरे बलिं राजानमीक्षतीम् ।  
 स्त्रीवृत्तिं चिरकालत्वाद्धन्तुं दिष्टः स्वमातरम् ॥  
 विमृश्य चिरकालं हि चितान्तं नाम्यपश्यत् । 108-109 ॥  
 SK. ib.

are women: That is how the ancient author of the Sūtras describes them. Fruit should be gathered from them. A wise man should not be fault-finding in their respect."<sup>1</sup> Hearing these wise words, Medhātithi Gautama (the father of C.) —It appears that Gautama was the family name and Medhātithi was the personal name of C's father—honoured that Brāhmaṇa. He was sorry and full of tears. In this repentant mood he thought to himself<sup>2</sup>: "Oh! on account of jealousy, I have come to such grief! Now who would save me from this sin? How good it would be, if my son Cirakārin would be late, according to his wont, in executing my command! O Cirakārin, if you would be late today, you would be true to your name. Save me from this sin which I have earned!" Thus brooding, Gautama, C's father, sought out C. and found him weapon in hand, with his mother. At the sight of the father, C. threw down the weapon, bowed at the feet of his father and sought his mercy and favour for having failed to discharge his order. Medhātithi, however, when he saw his son prostrate at his feet

- 1 एतस्मिन्नंतरे शक्रो ब्राह्मणं रूपमास्थितः ॥  
 गायन् गायामुपायातः पितुस्तस्याश्रमान्तिके ।  
 अनृता हि क्षियः सर्वाः सूत्रकारो यदब्रवीत् ॥  
 अतस्ताम्यः फलं श्राद्धं न स्याद्दोषेक्षणः सुधीः ।  
 इति श्रुत्वा तमानर्चं मेधातिथिरुदारधीः ॥  
 दुःखितश्चिन्तयन् प्राप्तो भृशमश्रूणि वर्षयन् । 109-112 ।

SK. 1b.

- 2 अहोऽहमीर्ष्याक्षिप्तो मग्नोऽहं दुःखसागरे ॥  
 हत्वा नारीं च साध्वीं च को नु मां तारयिष्यति ।  
 यद्ययं चिरकारी स्यात् स मां श्रयेत पातकात् ।  
 चिरकारिक भद्रं ते भद्रं ते चिरकारिक ॥  
 यद्यद्यं चिरकारी त्वं ततोऽसि चिरकारिकः ।  
 शहि मां मातरं चैव तपो यश्चाजितं मया ॥  
 एवं स दुःखितः प्राप्तो गौतमोऽचिन्तयत्तदा ।  
 चिरकारिकं ददर्शाय पुत्रं मालुरूपान्तिके ॥  
 (चिरकारी तु.....) शस्त्रं त्यक्त्वा स्थितो मूर्ध्ना प्रसादायोपचक्रमे ॥

॥ 112-118 ॥

SK. 1b.

and the wife alive, was mightily pleased, kissed and embraced his son and wished him long life. In that joy, he burst into a paean in praise of the action of *C.*, i.e. of his long reflection before doing an action: "One should hold counsel for a long time, give it up only after a long time. One should make friendship after a long time and should maintain it long. In matters of ill health, acts of arrogance, pride and hatred, in matters relating to any unpleasant action, in the case of friends, servants and women whose crimes are not obvious, it is the *Cirakārin*—one who reflects long before action, who is praised.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, in matters of urgent religious duties, in the presence of an enemy with weapon in hand, in imminent danger and in honouring good men *Cirakārin* i.e. one who takes time for long reflection before acting, is not commended"<sup>2</sup>. With these words Medhātithi Gautama accompanied by his wife and son, lived a holy life long in his hermitage and went finally to heaven.

The story of *C.* appears in almost identical verses in the Mbh. The Mbh. version of the story runs into about 150 lines

- <sup>1</sup> मेधातिथिः सुतं दृष्ट्वा शिरसा पतितं भुवि ॥  
 पत्नीं चैव तु जीवन्तीं परामभ्यगमन्मुदम् ।  
 ततः पित्रा चिरं स्मृत्वा चिरं चाप्राय मूर्धनि ।  
 चिरं दोष्यां परिष्वज्य चिरं जीवेत्युदाहृतः ॥  
 गाथाश्चाप्यब्रवीद्विद्वान् गौतमो मुनिसत्तमः ॥  
 चिरेण मंत्रं संधीयात् चिरेण च कृतं त्यजेत् ।  
 चिरेण विहितं मित्रं चिरं धारणमर्हति ॥  
 रोगे दर्पे च माने च द्रोहे पापे च कर्मणि ।  
 अप्रिये चैव कर्तव्ये चिरकारी प्रशस्यते ॥  
 बन्धूनां सुहृदां चैव भृत्यानां स्त्रीजनस्य च ।  
 अव्यक्तेष्वपराधेषु चिरकारी प्रशस्यते ॥ 118-126 ॥

SK. Ib.

- <sup>2</sup> धर्मे शत्रौ शस्त्रहस्ते पात्रे च निकटस्थिते ॥  
 भये च साधुपूजायां चिरकारी न शस्यते ।  
 एवमुक्त्वा पुत्रभार्यासहितः प्राप्य चाश्रमम् ॥  
 ततश्चिरमुपास्थाय दिवं यातश्चिरं मुनिः । 129-131 ।

SK. Ib.

of the Anuṣṭubh, while the SK. version into about 100. On a comparison of the texts of the two versions,<sup>1</sup> we find that the SK. version drops about 63 lines appearing in the Mbh., while it shows additional 15 lines. These differences are, however, very important from the point of their contents. We are here concerned with the differences. Before we discuss the contents of these differences and their implications in the light of the text of the Mbh. version, we shall recapitulate and emphasise certain important points in the story as told in the SK. version above. They are as follows :

(i) Nārada introduces the story of C. in his mood of self-condemnation for having pronounced a hasty impatient curse on Hārita. By telling the story of C, he means to suggest that he ought to have reflected a long time like C. before hurrying into the pronouncement of the curse.

(ii) C, while cogitating between the claims of the father and the mother on his affection, decides ultimately in favour of the mother. It seems that he feels more deeply attached to the mother and is overwhelmed by the feeling of gratitude for her on account of her sustained and patient care of the children.

(iii) The fault of the wife of Medhātithi Gautama lies in the fact that she once remained staring for a while at King Bali. The part that Indra plays in the affair is that of an adviser who impresses on Gautama that the latter should take a lenient view of his wife's laxity in view of the fact that women are constituted that way.

Now, when we come to the version of C.'s story as told in the Mbh., the first difference which strikes us is in the matter of the introduction of the story. In the Mbh., Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma : "How should one decide in the matter of doing a duty—whether speedily or late after a long time ? This is by all means a difficult matter in which I regard you

---

1. vide Appendix II, passage no. 5, page 2126 of the Śāntiparvan of the Mahābhārata (the critical edition of the Bhandarkar Oriental R. Institute).

as our greatest guide.”<sup>1</sup> In reply to Yudhiṣṭhira’s query, Bhīṣma recounts the ‘ancient story of C.’<sup>2</sup>

The diaskeuast who inserted this story as it stands in the Mokṣadharmaparvan of the Mbh. was perhaps led to insert it in this place i.e. as chapter 258 under the impression that the story highlights the doctrine of non injury or non-killing (अहिंसा). For, the chapter 257 viz. विचक्षुगीता and chapter 259 viz. सत्यवद्धुमत्सेनसंवाद respectively preceding and succeeding the चिरकारिकोपाख्यान (ch. 258) are, in their import and significance, mainly concerned with non-violence. Nīlakaṇṭha, the famous commentator of the Mbh. takes it in this sense; for he prefaces his commentary to this chapter by remarking that the doing of violence imposed at some body’s behest should be avoided by delay.<sup>3</sup>

The second difference which the Mbh. shows from the SK. is in the matter of an additional argument which C. puts forth in favour of the mother. After advancing the argument of the SK. in identical words that the mother, as धात्री, जननी, अम्बा, शुश्रूः has stronger claim over her children’s affections, the Mbh. sets forth in an additional passage an interesting additional argument as follows: “The couple copulate together. But

<sup>1</sup> युधिष्ठिर उवाच—

कथं कार्यं परीक्षेत शीघ्रं वाथ चिरेण वा ।

सर्वदा कार्यदुर्गोऽस्मिन् भवान्नः परमो गुरुः ॥

—Mbh. 12. 158. 1.

<sup>2</sup> भीष्म उवाच—

अत्राप्युदाहरन्तीममितिहासं पुरातनम् ।

चिरकारेस्तु यत्पूर्वं वृत्तमाङ्गिरसे कुले ॥

—Mbh ib. 2

The SK. also says that C. was born in the Āṅgīrasa family “चिरकारी  
.... ॥ पुरा हि ब्राह्मणः कवित्प्रख्यातोऽङ्गिरसां कुले ॥” 1. 2. 6. 89.

<sup>3</sup> ‘एवमहिंसाधर्मस्यावरयानुष्ठेयत्वमुक्त्वा  
कालविलम्बादिना परिहरेदिति प्रश्नपूर्वकमाख्यायिकामुक्तेनाह ।’

—नीलकण्ठ on Mbh. 12. 266.

(Chitraśhala press edition, Poona, 1932, page 501)

the fact (of the identity of the father of the child) rests on the mother. The father's family is that alone which the mother knows. Again, when the husband takes the hand of the wife in marriage, he alone becomes responsible for the lapse, if any. The wife is never responsible for the lapse. The husband is called the भर्ता because he feeds and sustains the wife ; he is called पति because he protects her. If he fails to do both these things, he is no longer the husband. Thus if there is any fault, it is the man's and never the woman's ; for it is ultimately on account of the man's incompetence that the lapse, if at all, occurs on the part of the woman."<sup>1</sup> The above argument is interesting because it exculpates the woman from the guilt of her lapse, holding her husband responsible for it, inasmuch as he could not protect her against temptation. In the S K. Version, however, the son does not raise the point of his mother's guilt at all. The sense of love and gratitude for the mother so much overwhelms him that the idea of guilt on the part of the mother does not at all weigh with him and he decides that the mother always deserves a place of honour. In the Mbh. version, however, the question of mother's guilt vis-a-vis the father is squarely faced and most ingeniously answered : Here the tables are turned against the father who, in a patriarchal system, is held to be the absolute custodian of the mother's morals.

The next point of difference—and the most important of all—of the Mbh. version from the SK. version is in respect of

- 
- <sup>1</sup> दम्पत्योः प्राणसंश्लेषे योऽभिसंधिः कुतः किल ।  
 तं माता वा पिता वेद भूतार्थो मातरि स्थितः ॥  
 माता जानाति यद् गोत्रं माता जानाति यस्य सः ।  
 पाणिबन्धं स्वयं कृत्वा सहधर्ममुपेत्य च ।  
 यदि याप्यन्ति पुरुषाः स्त्रियो नार्हन्ति याप्यताम् ॥  
 सरणाद्धि स्त्रियो भर्ता पात्याच्चैव स्त्रियाः पतिः ।  
 गुणस्यास्य निवृत्तौ तु न भर्ता न पतिः पतिः ॥  
 एवं स्त्री तापराप्नोति नर एवापराध्यति । ३२-३॥

—Mbh. *ibid.*

The main import and not the literal translation of these verses is given above, on the basis of the interpretation given by Nilakanṭha and Pratap Chandra Ray who has followed Nilakanṭha.



the nature and magnitude of the mother's guilt. We have seen above in the SK. version that the mother's guilt lay in her lapse of merely having gazed at King Bali. There India merely played the part of an adviser who advised Gautama to take a lenient view of the affair. In the Mbh. version, however, in a passage which is found dropped in the SK., Indra plays the active and principal part in seducing and ravishing the wife of Gautama (the mother of Cukārin). Both Gautama and Cirakārin know it and still hold the wife and the mother respectively as guiltless in the exigency of that particular situation, of course, on different grounds. C. argues that Indra approached his mother in the guise of Gautama, his father, and that, therefore, it was no fault of his mother, if she answered the overtures of India, in her husband's guise. Further he says that if it was anybody's fault or sin, it was Indra's; for it was Indra who had put sexual passion in women's nature and who now took advantage of that trait in the particular case. C.'s words in the Mbh. passage are as follows: "A husband is the highest object with the wife and the highest deity to her. My mother gave up her sacred person to one that came to her in the form and guise of her own husband. Then again the sinfulness (in this case) is evident of India himself who (by acting in the way he did) caused the recollection of the request that had been made to him in days of yore by women (when a third part of the sin of Brāhmanicide of which Indra himself was guilty, was cast upon her sex)."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> स्त्रिया हि परमो भर्ता दैवतं परमं स्मृतम् ।

तस्यात्मना तु सदृशमात्मानं परमं ददौ ॥

यश्चतोक्तो हि निर्देशः स्त्रिया मैश्वर्यस्ये ।

तस्य स्मारयतो व्यक्तमधर्मो नात्र संशयः ॥ 37-38

Mbh. ib.

The translation given above of these two verses is that of Pratap Chandra Ray who has followed Nilakanṭha's interpretation of the verses. In view of the importance of these obscure verses, we give below Nilakanṭha's relevant commentary (on these verses) which forms the basis of the translation above :

“स्त्रिया हि इति । तस्य आत्मना शरीरेण सदृशं इन्द्रम् आलक्ष्येति शेषः ।  
आत्मानं शरीरं परमं श्रेष्ठं ददौ । स्वपतिवेषेणागताय परस्मै पतिबुद्ध्या शरीरं प्रयच्छन्त्या

In the same Mbh. version Medhātithi Gautama, C.'s father, holds his wife not guilty on quite different grounds from those of C. In his words, they are as follows :<sup>1</sup>

"Indra, the lord of the three worlds arrived at my hermitage as a guest in the guise of a Brāhmaṇa. He was comforted with words and honoured with welcome by her who treated all guests equally. She also gave him, as was customary, water to wash his feet and usual offerings of *Aryhya*. She said to him that she was a dependant (being a wife to another) and that she would honour him only according to the requirements of ordinary courtesy. If in such a situation, something untoward happens, it is not the woman's fault. So none is at fault—neither my wife, nor I, nor the guest Indra."

It will be clear from the above summary that the Mbh. version of C.'s story shows a very significant difference from

मम मातुर्न व्यभिचारदोषोऽस्ति । गर्भानुत्पत्तेः कुलसंकराभावात्तर्ह्य वध्येत्यर्थः ॥ यश्चनेति ।  
चनशब्दोऽप्यर्थे योऽपि मैथुनजन्यवृत्तये निर्देशो वचनं उक्त इन्द्रं प्रति इति शेषः । एवं  
द्वुपाख्यायते—त्वष्टुः पुत्रस्त्रिशिराः इन्द्रेण हतः तद्धत्यायाः तुतीयांशः स्त्रीषु रजोरूपेण  
स्थापितः द्वौ वृक्षभूम्योः नियसोषरूपौ स्थापितौ तदा क्रीभिर्वैरः प्राथितः—काममावि-  
जनितोः सम्भवामेति । अस्माकं जननपर्यन्तं पुंस्त्वसंगोऽस्त्विति । सोऽयं निर्देशः स्त्रिया  
उक्तः तस्य तं स्मारयतः स्वहत्यांशनिघानेन तत्स्मरणप्रयोजकस्थेन्द्रस्यैव व्यक्तम् अधर्मः  
न तु मम मातुः अत्र संशयो नास्ति । तस्मादिन्द्रस्यापराधान्मम मातुर्वधो न न्याय्यः  
इति भावः ॥" Mbh. 12. 208, 30-41

(Chitrashala Press edition, p. 503)

1 आश्रमं मम सम्प्राप्तास्त्रिलोकेशः पुरन्दरः ।

अतिथिन्नतमास्थाय ब्राह्मणं रूपमास्थितः ॥

समया सान्त्वितो वाग्भिः स्वागतेनाभिपूजितः ।

अर्घ्यं पाद्यं च न्यायेन तथाभिप्रतिपादितः ॥

परदत्तस्मि चाप्युक्तः प्रणयिष्ये नयेन च ।

अत्र चाकुशले जाते स्त्रियो नास्ति व्यतिक्रमः ॥

एवं न स्त्री न चैवाहं नाध्वगस्त्रिदशेश्वरः ।

अपराध्यति धर्मस्य प्रमादस्त्वपराध्यति ॥ 44-47

Mbh ib.

On the last quarter of the above verse 47, Nilakanṭha has the following interesting comment. "धर्मस्य योगसम्बन्धिप्रमादोऽनवधानता । इन्द्रस्यानपराधत्वं  
ऐश्वराहृत्यानुनिर्नेहोक्तं न तु व्यग्रहारतः ।" (Chitrashala Press edition, p. 504.)

story in the SK. version, however, embodies and adapts a quite different story viz. the story of Jamadagni, Repukā and their son Paraśurāma. It will be recalled that in the original story Repukā was accused of guilt similar to that of the mother of C. : Repukā was found guilty of gazing at a Gandharva King for which the indignant Jamadagni ordered Paraśurāma, one of his sons, to behead his mother. Paraśurāma instantly carried out the command of his father. Paraśurāma was not, however, devoid of filial love towards his mother ; for, he asked a boon from his father who was pleased with his dutiful son that his mother should be restored back to life, without retaining any memory of her having been beheaded by her son. The SK. version, while following the Jamadagni–Repukā model, deviates from it in putting C. in place of Paraśurāma and in making him put off the execution of the father's order until the father arrives on the scene.

The main import of the C. story is, no doubt, its impressive emphasis on the advisability of reflection before action or of thoughtful action. It may be said to be a good illustration of the famous verse in this behalf of Bhāravi :<sup>1</sup>

सहसा विदधीत न क्रियाम् अविवेकः परमापदा पदम् ।

ब्रूयते हि विमृश्यकारिणं गुणलुब्धाः स्वयमेव संपदः ॥

In fact Nārada, in the version of the SK. given above, while setting out to relate the story of C., appears to echo the very words of the above stanza in the verse—

सहसा न क्रियां कुर्यात् पदमेतन्महापदाम् ।

विमृश्यकारिणं घोरं ब्रूयते सर्वसंपदः ॥

already quoted in Footnote 6. The above verse in the SK. followed by the story of C. in the sequel equates, in effect, चिरकारिन् with विमृश्यकारिन् and sets forth an opposition, as in Bhāravi's verse, between सहसा क्रियां कुर्यात् and विमृश्यकारिन्. It may be pointed out that Mbh. version nowhere expresses such opposition in explicit terms.

1. *Kirīṭarjunīyam* II. 30.

The story of C. in both the versions—the *Mbh.* and the *SK.*—may be said to indicate a significant change in outlook towards moral lapses and the individual's responsibility (for the moral lapses). In the old Gautama-Ahalyā (Indra) and Jamadagni-Revukā (Paraśurāma) stories there is found little regard and understanding for the moral position and the psychological condition of the wife and the son. The will of the patriarch is supreme and his command is to be carried out peremptorily. There is, however, a refreshing humane change in this outlook in the C. stories. The son is, no longer, an automaton involuntarily carrying out the command of the father but an intelligent thinking individual weighing the pros and cons of the situation. He thinks that the mother is also an individual having her own moral dignity and self-respect and has with the father equal, if not more, claims on his love and affection. The father or the patriarch of the family, after issuing his peremptory command, has also his second thoughts and develops an understanding sympathy for the wife and the son and a humane discernment between major and minor lapses (as in the case of the *SK.* version) or between witting and unwitting lapses (as in the *Mbh.* version).

We have dealt with the important differences between the *Mbh.* and the *SK.* versions of the C. story and pointed out some of the implications stemming from them. Before we conclude, it would be advisable to touch on the time-relation between the texts of the two versions. The *SK.*, as it stands at present, is judged by competent scholars as not being earlier than 700 A.D.<sup>1</sup> The *Mbh.* in its present size is generally believed to have existed by the 4th century A.D. Judging by these dates, one may be tempted to say that the *SK.* version of the C. story may have been the direct borrower from the *Mbh.* version. In fact, more than half the verses bearing on the C. episode are common to both. But if one takes into consideration the remarkable differences discussed above between

---

1. vide R. O. Hazra 'Studies in Puranic Records etc.' p. 165 : "There seems to be little in it (the present Skanda) which can be dated earlier than 700 A. D."

the two versions, one may not be sure whether there was a direct borrowing of the SK from the Mbh. The differences are so remarkable that they may lead one to conclude that both the versions drew upon a common floating version of the story, adapting the material with suitable changes. Even so, one can not resist the impression that the version of C. story retained after adaptation by the Mbh. appears to belong to an earlier time than that of the SK. The impression is based on two reasons : one, in contrast to the Mbh., the SK. introduction of the story, as already pointed out above evidently appears to echo words of Bhāravi (5th century); the second reason is that the Mbh. version works up into its story the motifs of two ancient stories—that of Gautama-Ahalyā-Indra and of Jamadagni-Reṇukā (Paraśurāma). The mixing of the two motifs makes the story unnecessarily complex and introduces elements which detract from the telling effect of the C. story. The author of the SK version must have realized the awkward complexity caused by the mixing of the two motifs and must have thought it advisable to economize in the interest of the story by retaining only one motif viz. that of Jamadagni-Reṇukā-Paraśurāma and thus make the story simple, direct and more telling.

## विष्णुकृतं गणेशस्तोत्रम्

( ब्रह्मवैवर्त्त०, गणपतिखण्ड, अ० १३; आनन्दाश्रम० )

[ अथ विष्णुः सभामध्ये त सम्पूज्य गणेश्वरम् ।

तुष्ट्वा परया भक्त्या सर्वविघ्नविनाशकम् ॥ ४० ॥

विष्णुर्वाच—

ईश त्वां स्तोतुमिच्छामि ब्रह्मज्योतिः सनातनम् ।

नैव वर्णयितुं शक्तोऽस्म्यनुरूपमनीहकम् ॥ ४१ ॥

प्रवरं सर्वदेवानां सिद्धानां योगिनां गुरुम् ।

सर्वस्वरूपं सर्वेशं ज्ञानराशिस्वरूपिणम् ॥ ४२ ॥

अव्यक्तमक्षरं नित्यं सत्प्रमात्मस्वरूपिणम् ।

वायुतुल्यं च निर्लिप्तं चाक्षतं सर्वसाक्षिणम् ॥ ४३ ॥

संसारार्णवपारे च मायापोते सुदुर्लभे ।

कर्णधारस्वरूपं च भक्तानुग्रहकारकम् ॥ ४४ ॥

वरं वरेण्यं वरदं वरदानामपीश्वरम् ।

सिद्धं सिद्धिस्वरूपं च सिद्धिदं सिद्धिसाधनम् ॥ ४५ ॥

ध्यानातिरिक्तं ध्येयं ध्यानासाध्यं च धार्मिकम् ।

धर्मस्वरूपं धर्मज्ञं धर्माधर्मफलप्रदम् ॥ ४६ ॥

बीजं संसारवृक्षाणामङ्कुरं च तदाश्रयम् ।

स्त्रीपुंनपुंसकानां च रूपमेतदतीन्द्रियम् ॥ ४७ ॥

सर्वाद्यमग्रपूज्यं च सर्वपूज्यं गुणार्णवम् ।

स्वेच्छया सगुणं ब्रह्म निर्गुणं स्वेच्छया पुनः ॥ ४८ ॥

स्वयं प्रकृतिरूपं च प्राकृतं प्रकृतेः परम् ।

त्वां स्तोतुमक्षमोऽनन्तः सहस्रवदनैरपि ॥ ४९ ॥

न क्षमः पञ्चवक्त्रश्च न क्षमश्चतुराननः ।

सरस्वती न शक्ता च न च शक्तोऽहं तव स्तुतौ ।

न शक्ताश्च चतुर्वेदाः के वा ते वेदवादिनः ॥ ५० ॥

## LITERARY AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

The following is a brief review of the work of the Purāṇa-Department and of the other cultural activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, carried out since the publication of the previous review in '*Purāṇa*' (III. 2)

### Critical Editions of the Purāṇas.

1. *Matsya-Purāṇa*. As has already been noted in the previous review, four manuscripts of the Matsya-Purāṇa, deposited in the Oriental Library, Mysore, have also been collated besides the thirty manuscripts collated previously, a detailed description of which appeared in '*Purāṇa*' Vol. I (pp. 101-111). The additional verses of these four manuscripts have also been copied separately and arranged alphabetically. A separate inventory of the Matsya-Purāṇa verses missing in the four Mysore-Mss. has also been prepared. In addition to this, the following work at Madras has also been done under the guidance and supervision of Dr. V. Raghavan :

- (i) In collecting Matsya-Purāṇa quotations from the Smṛti-Nibandhas and noting variants found therein, fifty more Nibandhas have been gone through during this period ; such as दण्डविवेक, विवादरत्नाकर, गोत्रप्रवरनिबन्ध-कदम्ब, व्यवहारनिर्णय, कृत्यसारसमुच्चय, दानमयूख, मदनमहाणव, स्मृतिरत्नाकर, पुरुषार्थचिन्तामणि, etc.
- (ii) Extra verses in the Nibandhas examined so far, which are not found in the printed editions of the Matsya-Purāṇa, have been separately copied ;
- (iii) A complete Examination of the Matsya-Purāṇa as compared with all other Purāṇas has been made to find out how many lines of the Matsya are there which are not traceable in the other Purāṇas. A concordance of these verses of the Matsya has been prepared ;

- (iv) An inventory with chapter-references of the Matsya-Purāṇa quotations found in the Śabdakalpadruma has also been prepared, and variants noted ;
- (v) Availing of the opportunity of the Srinagar Session of All-India Oriental Conference, Matsya-Mss. in Jammu and Hoshiaipur were examined by Dr. V. Raghavan ; noteworthy points and necessary data have been collected from these manuscripts.

2. *Vāmana-Purāṇa* : As has been stated previously, Dr. V. S. Agrawala of the Banaras Hindu University has been entrusted with the work of preparing the critical edition of the Vāmana-Purāṇa. For this purpose several Mss. have been collated, a detailed description of which was given in '*Purāṇa*', (Vol. III, No. 1). The Bengali-script manuscript (No. 353-71-B-3 ; No. 3989 of H. P. Shastri's Catalogue, V) belonging to the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, is now being collated at Varanasi, and the collation of the Śāradā Manuscript procured from the B. H. University is also shortly to be taken in hand. It might be noted here that there is a dearth of scholars who can easily read and collate the old Śāradā and Bengali Mss. of the Purāṇas. Some Mss. of the Vāmana-Purāṇa appearing as its older version, and showing the Vaiṣṇava character of the old Vāmana P. are deposited in the Sarasvatī Mahal Library, Tanjore (South India). Their collation has been arranged under the supervision of Dr. V. Raghavan at Madras. An alphabetical pāda-index of the ślokas of the Vāmana-Purāṇa has also been prepared for collecting Vāmana-Purāṇa quotations from the Nibandha-granthas.

### Purāṇa-Concordance

The Purāṇa Concordance according to the plan published in '*Purāṇa*' Vol. I, No. 1, is in progress. A complete subject-index of the Vāmana-Purāṇa has been published in '*Purāṇa*' Vol. III, No. 1, and that of the Kūrma-Purāṇa in '*Purāṇa*' Vol. III, No. 2, for eliciting the opinions of scholars. The work on the other Purāṇas is also going on. The subject-index of the



Viṣṇu Purāṇa which has been completed is now being revised. The subject-slips of the Brahma, Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Agni and Liṅga Purāṇas have been prepared and are to be revised.

Formerly it was planned that the work of preparing the subject-concordance of all the Purāṇas should be done together, so that a complete and integrated subject-concordance of the Purāṇas may be prepared. But now for the sake of convenience the Concordance is to be prepared in three volumes, each volume will contain the concordance of about six Purāṇas. The first volume of the Concordance of six Purāṇas is now being prepared.

### **'Purāṇa' Bulletin**

The 'Purāṇa' Bulletin which has now become an important organ of the Purāṇa Department of the Kashiraj Trust, and which provides an exclusive forum for Puranic studies has secured the appreciation and co-operation of prominent Indologists, both Indian and foreign. A number of Oriental Journals—such as 'Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, the 'Orientalist', Poona, the Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, the Journals of the Adyar Library and the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, the 'Oriental Research', Madras, 'Our Heritage' of the Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 'Archiv Orientalni' (Journal of the Oriental Institute of Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Prague), the 'WZKSU' (Journal of the Indological Institute, University of Vienna), 'East and West' (Journal of the Italian Institute, Rome), and several others are received by us in exchange of our 'PURĀṆA' Bulletin. Besides these Oriental Research-Journals, we also receive 'Kalyāṇa' of the Gita Press, Gorakhpur, the 'Advent' of the Aravindo Ashrama, Pondicherry, 'Bhārati Bhavana Journal' and 'Bhārati' of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavana, Bombay, on the exchange basis.

### **All-India Oriental Conference, Srinagar**

We are glad to note that Dr. V. Raghavan, who is a member of our Purāṇa-Committee and of the Editorial Board, was

elected as the General President of the Samagat session of this Conference. In his Presidential address he made a reference to the project of the All-India Kashiraj Trust for the critical editions of the Purāṇas, and specially to the Matsya Purāṇa edition which is being prepared at Madras under his own editorship. Prof. D. R. Mankad also in his Presidential address in the History Section referred to the efforts of the Kashiraj Trust for Purāṇic textual reconstruction in the form of the critical editions of the Purāṇas.

Shri Anand Swarup Gupta represented the All-India Kashiraj Trust, and read his paper there. At this conference he also contacted a number of scholars, specially those interested in the Purāṇic studies, and acquainted them with the Purāṇa-work of the Kashiraj Trust. Sardar K. M. Panikkar, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Jammu and Kashmir, in his letter of 25th December, much appreciated the Purāṇa project of the Kashiraj Trust and has specially shown his interest in the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin. Shri A. S. Gupta also visited the Raghunath Sanskrit Library at Jammu, and consulted some important Mss. of Matsya and Vāmana Purāṇas. It contains about 7000 manuscripts including about 300 Purāṇa Mss. It is expected that in future the Trust will be able to make use of this collection with the kind help of the Library-Authorities.

### Veda-Pārāyaṇa

As has been said in the previous review, the *pārāyaṇa* (recitation of the complete text) of the Veda from memory is arranged twice a year on the Vyāsa Pūrṇimā (July) and Vasanta Pañchamī (Jan.-Feb.) occasions, with an annual donation of Rs. 1100 by H. H. Maharaja Dr. Shri Vibhuti Narayan Singh. On the present Vasanta Pañchamī occasion, the Ṛgveda with its Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad is being recited from memory by Pt. Sakharām Maheshwar Padhye of Kolhapur Distt. (Maharashtra).

### **Purāṇa Pāṭha and Pravachana**

According to the scheme given in the last review, the Varāha Purāṇa was recited in November last, and a series of nine discourses on it were delivered by Pt. Neelmeghacharya, Professor of Sanskrit University, Varanasi. In the present month (Feb.) the Kālikā Purāṇa has been recited, and a series of discourses on it have been given by Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Datar of the Sāṅga Veda Vidyālaya, Varanasi.

### **Shivala Bhavana Pravachana Kendra**

Shri Dilip Kumar Roy, a great devotee and scholar, gave a discourse on *bhakti* in the Shivala Bhavana Pravachana-Kendra, on 10th Nov. and on the following day sang devotional songs or *bhajan*s which attracted a large audience and kept the listeners spell-bound. He, with his party, stayed at the Nadesar House for two days as the guest of His Highness, the Chairman of the Kashiraj Trust.

### **Visit by distinguished scholars**

Several distinguished foreign scholars interested in Indology, visited the Purāṇa Department, and acquainted themselves with the Purāṇa project of the Kashiraj Trust. The Chairman of the Trust personally discussed with these scholars the activities of the Trust. The literature so far published by the Trust was also presented to them. Among these scholars the names of Dr. Nasr, Professor of Philosophy in the Tehran University, Dr. Juan Roger Riviere, Prof. of Indology in the University of Madrid and Chief Scientific Officer of the Higher Council for Scientific Research of Spain and also a contributor to our 'Purāṇa' Bulletin, Prof. Philippe Lavistine of Paris University, and Prof. R. H. L. Slater of the Center for the Study of World Religions, Harvard University, deserve special mention. The first two scholars stayed at Nadesar House as the guests of His Highness.

The delegates of the All-India Numismatic Society attending its Jubilee Celebrations at Varanasi, and the delegates

of the All-India Philosophical Conference and Social Conference which also held their Sessions at Varanasi, were entertained at a tea-party by His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh in the last week of December. These delegates acquainted themselves with the Purāṇa work and other cultural activities of the Kashiraj Trust. Dr. A. K. Narayan, Secretary of the Numismatic Society, and Dr. T. Mahadevan, President of the Philosophical Conference, specially showed interest in the Purāṇa work of the Trust. These scholars were good enough to show their readiness for co operating with the cultural activities and specially the Purāṇa work of the Kashiraj Trust

### Critical Edition of Rāmacharita-Mānasa

The critically edited version of Gosvāmī Tulasīdāsa's Rāmacharita-Mānasa published by the Kashiraj Trust was released on the 12th January, 1962. At a public function arranged by the Trust at the Shivala Bhavana the first copy of this publication was presented by its editor, Acharya Shri Vishwanath Prasad Misra, to Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, who received it reverentially, and remarked in his speech that the Rāmacharita-Mānasa is a great epic which has moulded the lives of millions of the people in India and has become a part of their lives.

Originally the work of the critical edition of the Rāmacharita-Mānasa was started by His Highness Maharaja Ishwari Prasad Narayan Singh in 1846, when the modern graph-system of collation was pioneered by the scholars of Kashi who collated a number of Mānasa-Mss. for the purpose of preparing its authentic edition; but somehow the work could not proceed further at that time. By God's grace it has now seen its completion.

The present work is the first of its kind. It is a scientifically prepared edition of the Rāmacharita-Mānasa, prepared after examining all the available manuscript-evidence dating within a hundred years of the Poet's death. The personal Library of His Highness, the Maharaja of Banaras, contains one of the richest

collections of the Mānasa literature, which was made available to the Kashiraj Trust for this purpose. The Trust also procured other Manuscripts from different collections in India and abroad. The present Maharaja, His Highness Maharaja Vibhuti Narayan Singh donated a sum of Rs. 50,000/- to the Trust, to complete the work of the critical edition of the Mānasa started by his illustrious great-grand-father, Maharaja Ishwari Prasad Narayan Singh, a hundred years ago.

The Kashiraj Trust gratefully acknowledges the kind help given by the Banaras Hindu University and specially by its Vice-Chancellor, Justice Sri N. H. Bhagavati, in lending the services of Prof. Vishwanath Prasad Misra for preparing the critical edition of the Rāmacharita-Mānasa.

On the occasion of the release of the Mānasa edition, His Highness, the Maharaja of Banaras, gave a garden party to the honoured guests, Shri U. Nu, Prime Minister of Burma, and Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, on 12th January, 1962, both of whom were his guests at the Nadesur House.

We offer our felicitations to His Highness Maharaja Shri Vibhuti Narayan Singh, Chairman of the Kashiraj Trust, on his receiving the degree of D. Litt. *honoris causa* from the Banaras Hindu University this year for his patronage, contribution and advancement of the cause of education and Indology.

We also offer our hearty congratulations to Dr. V. Raghavan for his receiving the Republic Day honour of Padma Bhushan.

## BOOK-REVIEW

Willibald Kirfel: Zur Eschatologie von Welt und Leben (Ein Puranischer Text Nebst Ubertragung in Text Geschichtlichen Darstellung)—Bonn 1959.

The works of Prof. Kirfel, in the field of Purāṇic Studies are well known. Let us only recall his monumental *Die Kosmographie Der Inder* (Bonn 1920), *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (1927), *Bhāratavarṣa*, an essay in puranic geography (1931) and *Das Purāṇa Vom Weltgebäude* (1954).

The present book written thirteen years ago, but published only recently, is concerned with the 'eschatology' or the representations of the 'ultimate ends' of "world and life" in the Purāṇas. It corroborates, according to the author, the thesis propounded by him, in his previous works, that the huge puranic literature has been compiled, in an Age of Renaissance, out of a multiplicity of shorter and more ancient treatises which were originally standing by themselves and have been welded, as it were, in these composite works called Purāṇas (Page VII).

In his Introduction, Prof. Kirfel gives a sketch of puranic cosmology and compares it briefly to other cosmologies of the Middle East (Babylon and Iran) and of the West. Speaking for instance about the Iranian conception of a world-year of 12000 earthly years, he says that Hinduism conceived the same as composed of 12000 heavenly or divine years, one year of this kind being made of 360 earthly years, the result being a World year of a much greater duration, of 43,20,000 earthly years. Another difference is that the Iranians divided their world year equally in four parts of 3000 years, while the Indians divided it according to the progression of 4:3:2:1, viz. Kṛta-yuga (14,40,000), Tretā (10,80,000), Dvāpara (of 7,20,000) and Kali (3,60,000). During these 4 ages, the colour of the body of Viṣṇu changes from White and Red to Yellow and Black,

respectively the colours of the 4 castes. And when the Dharma which was four-legged (*Catuspād*) or complete in the first Age has lost his last leg in the darkest part of the Black Age, i. e. when the world or Dharma is practically at end, comes the new creation (*pratisarga*), as the dawn after the night, according to an eternal descending (*avasarpinī*) and ascending (*utsarpinī*) line. These views, among many others, are compared to similar and dis-similar views of the other traditions.

The bulk of the book is composed of Purāṇic texts. Excerpts from Viṣṇu Purāṇa VI. 1-1-58 ; VI. 2, 1-40 ; VI. 3, 1-41 ; VI. 4-1-49 ; VI. 5-1-87 ; Brahma Purāṇa chapters 229, 231-233, also 122, 124, 126 ; Agni Purāṇa chapters 358, 369 ; Brahmāṇḍa (chapter III, 1-23) and Vāyu Purāṇa (chapter 102, 1-31) have been here critically edited, translated and compared with each other. The author finds in this way different strata, and he makes his best to distinguish the most ancient from the new, going in such details that it is impossible to do justice to his analyses in this short paper. To give only one example, he says that the compiler of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa had before his eyes evidently the text or fragment of the text which is to be found in Brahma Purāṇa under the name of Vedavyāsa Dvaipāyana. Now we find this text on the lips of Parāśara in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. In order to motivate such exclusion, the compiler of Viṣṇu Purāṇa must have had recourse to a *pia fraud* (pious cheating) etc. The conclusion of the work is given in a "Kritische text analyse" where the author stresses the necessity of comparing the different puranic versions of the same subjects, if we wish to obtain an idea of the former works out of which they were compiled. Reading for instance, the chapter VI of Viṣṇu Purāṇa without comparing it with the chapters of Brahma-Purāṇa which deal with the same 'eschatologic' topics, we might have thought that the author of Viṣṇu Purāṇa was expounding his own ideas. This erroneous view can be excluded only when we know all the parallel versions. The Purāṇas do not compose a homogenous

whole. Nevertheless, many teachings of a previous age, namely the teachings of the theist Sāṃkhya-Philosophy have been incorporated in a great number of them. The author does not say that even Vedic teachings might have been incorporated in the Purāṇas.

PHILIPPE LAVASTINE.

मार्कण्डेय पुराण—एक सांस्कृतिक अध्ययन MĀRKANDEYA PURĀṆA—A CULTURAL COMMENTARY). By Dr. Vasudeva Shastana Agrawala, Professor, Banaras Hindu University. Published by the Hindustani Academy, Allahabad. 1961. pp. 9 + 194. Price Rs. 8.50.

This work is a running commentary on the Mārkandeya Purāṇa, presenting an interpretation of its contents from two points of view—viz. firstly cultural history and secondly, which is more important and basic, an exposition of the symbolism embodied in the Purāṇic legends on the basis of their Vedic background and metaphysical thought. The Purāṇas were, in reality, designed primarily to offer a symbolical formulation of Vedic cosmogony in the form of Ākhyānas. So if one wishes to understand the Veda, one should know the Purāṇas and *vice-versa*. The unlocking of the symbolical treasure-chest hidden in the Purāṇas and the Vedas leads to the inevitable conviction that the Vedas and the Purāṇas represent the two sides of the same coin and are a mutual revivification of the same idea.

The above point of view is amply illustrated by the learned author in his present study of the Mārkandeya P. From the book which is extremely rich in its contents we may take a few examples :

The author tells us that the four interlocutors represented as the four pious and spiritually minded Birds are really the four Vedas. Then he goes on to explain the symbolism of Nara and Nārāyaṇa—the meaning of *nārāṇ* and its equation with *āpaṇ*, the abode of Nārāyaṇa in the primeval Ocean as the Puruṣa or what in the Vedas is known as the Hiranyagarbha



or the Golden Germ. In the *Pāñcā-rātra* symbolism this was transformed into *Catur-vyūha* formula—namely, Vāsudeva corresponding to *Sahasra-śrīṣṭā* Puruṣa (*parātipara*), Balaiāma to *Svayambhū* Puruṣa (= Nara or *avyaya* Puruṣa), Pradyumna to Virāj or Parameṣṭhin (= *āpaḥ* or *nārāḥ*), and Aniruddha to Hiraṇyagarbha or *hara* Puruṣa or *Vairāja* Puruṣa or Brahṇā. This doctrine occurs in several Purāṇas and has been clearly enunciated in the present treatise.

Another instance is the explanation of the symbolism contained in the thirteen chapters of the well-known *Devī-Māhātmya*. Here the cosmogonic principles behind the conception of Devī are fully explained. Devī symbolises Power and Energy, Madhu-Kaiṭabha, as the two aspects of Parameṣṭhin, symbolise *rajas* and *tamas* or *brahmaudāna* and *pravargya*; Mahiṣāsurā is the Purāṇic version of the Vedic Vṛtra who represents darkness and comes into conflict with Indra, the power of light, the immortal god. The Vedic conflict of Indra and Vṛtra is exemplified in the conflict of Devī and Mahiṣa, involving a mass of other symbolical definitions which have also been clearly explained.

A third example is that of Sūrya and of the various members of his family like his three wives—Samjñā, Chājñā and Aśvā (the form assumed by Samjñā), and his several offspring like Yama, Yamī, Aśvinī-Kumāras and Śāvarṇi Manu, etc.

The web of these stories becomes illumined when their symbolism is properly grasped. There is the real wealth of the Purāṇic version.

There are also many interesting portions explaining the cultural material of the Māikaṇḍeya Purāṇa, e. g. those relating to the story of Satyavādī Hariścandra (a new creation of the Gupta-period-storytellers in contrast to that of the Aitareya Br.), of the Avadhūta Dattatreya, and of Alarka and his mother Madālasā, a type of the ideal woman in the Golden Age, and of the *Bhuvanakośa* chapters of which there are two versions viz. the

traditional lists of the Janapadas, Mountains, Rivers, etc., as found in so many other Purāṇas, and a special *Kārm-rī'hāja* geography of India compiled during the Gupta-period, to which the present book offers many new identifications.

The work is replete with much useful material for Purāṇic studies in general. It is desirable that similar analytical studies are made available on the other Purāṇic texts also.

A. S. Gupta

SPARKS FROM THE VEDIC FIRE (A New Approach to Vedic Symbolism). By Dr. V. S. Agrawala. Published by The Director, School of Vedic Studies, Banaras Hindu University. Sole Distributor: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi—I. Price Rs. 30/-.

According to Professor Agrawala, the problem of Vedic interpretation is fundamentally the problem of symbols. Great scholars both from the West and East have tried to understand the Vedas, but their attempts have yielded only superficial results so far as the real problem of decoding the thoughts of the Rishis is concerned. This was due not to any inherent drawback in the academic equipment of these savants, but it was due to their failure to appreciate the correct value of the symbols in which Vedic thought was deliberately couched by the original thinkers. This important fact must be realised and admitted to carve a real entrance to this fascinating study which to my mind, has a value not only for India but for all humanity, because Indian symbolism holds the key to the cosmic thought and its concrete formulations by the peoples of many countries and ages. It is the domain of widest synthesis and not of conflict; it is this basic concord which intelligent men in all countries are seeking to day to reclaim the lost language of their religious disciplines.

Here comes to our help this latest book by Prof. Agrawala who has given us a sampling of the meanings of the Vedic symbols in a series of essays, which I consider both learned

and brilliant, and, what is more, as representing the correct traditional Indian point of view. For Prof. Agrawala the Indian evidence is of value for a fresh attuning of the mind to the thought of the Rishis in the mantras. He says graphically that "the exploding meaning of the symbol in a mantra is as gladdening as divine encounter." For example, the Forest represents the infinite source of cosmic generation and the Tree stands for the Tree of Existence; Pestle and Mortar signify the two Clashing Rocks; and even the despised croaking Frog (*Maṇḍūkā*) is the sign of the Individuated Life-principle stirred to activity by the drops of the heavenly clouds, that is, Universal Life-forces moistening the material existence. The author has pointed out in the Preface that the familiar domestic and natural objects have been used by the Rishis as pegs for the mystical meanings intended by them. Sun, Moon, Water, Fire, Sky, Earth, Day, Night, Hill, River, Wheel, Cow, Horse, Eagle, Dragon, are frequently used as the alphabet of the language of Infinite Nature. These symbols do not change or evolve their meaning: they are changeless in time and place. Similarly family relationship, as Father, Mother, Brother, Sister, Son, Daughter, are entities of householed life with the meaning of which we are familiar. So also the Wheel, Car, Full Vase, Bowl, House, Door, Pillar, Bricks, Bow and Arrow etc. have been employed in the Vedas as pegs to fasten the meanings constituting the metaphysical thought of the Seers.

It is to the credit of the author that he draws our attention to this aspect of Vedic interpretation, which may be completely new for many students of the Vedas. There are twelve papers in the book entitled Prajāpati, Agni, Hiraṇyagarbha, Three Brothers of Agni, One-footed Goat (*Aja Ekapād*), Gaurī, Suparṇa, Nāsadiya Sūkta, Riddles of Rishi Vasukra, One Rudra and the Many, Aṣṭamūrti Śiva and Purāṇa-Vidyā. It is hardly possible in a review like this to do justice to the meaning and information conveyed by the author. But to take one example, the One-footed Goat is not a creature of fancy but the symbol of the Unborn Creator whom the Vedas

also refer to the Aja, and who is called one-footed because as the unborn principle he represents the Principle of Rest preceding the creation. The analysis of the idea of Suparna representing the Great Bird of Time flapping its two wings on a flight of a thousand days is powerful. The big paper on the Riddles of Rishi Varaha offers for the first time a rational exegesis of the very enigmatical hymn of Rigveda, X. 27-28 and removes the veil of obscurity from about a hundred Vedic terms. The charming illustration in gold and blue of Hiranya-garbhā on the Golden Egg, floating in the cosmic Ocean, taken from an old Kangra painting is a feast for the eyes. In the last three essays on the book, the author has ably shown the amplifying inter-relation of the Purāṇas to the Vedas.

PHILIPPE LAVASTINE.



# पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. IV, No. 2 ]

व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः

6 AUG 1962

18 \* THIRU  
[17 July, 1962]

## लेखसूची—Contents

	Page
1. व्यास-वन्दना [Obeisance to Vyāsa]	231
व्यास-वर्णनम् [Description of Vyāsa]	232
2. अगस्त्यप्रोक्तं पापशमनं नाम हरिशंकरस्तोत्रम् [The praise of Hari and Śaṅkara, called the remover of evils or sins, composed by Sage Agastya]	233-235
3. भारतीयराजनीतौ पुराणपञ्चलक्षणम् [The five characteristics of the Purāṇas in the ancient Political Works of India]	236-244
By Pt. Rajeswar Shastri Dravid ; Principal, Sāṅga-Veda-Vidyālaya, Varanasi	
4. The Geographical Text of the Purāṇas : A Further Critical Study (Continued from the previous No.) [पुराणानां भुवनकोश-ग्रन्थाः-तेषामपरमालोचनात्मकमध्ययनम् (पूर्वतोऽनुवृत्तम्)]	245-276
By Dr. C. A. Lewis ; 22, Dunkirk Road, Fishponds, Bristol, England.	
5. पुराणेष्वपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः [Non-Pāṇinian uses in the Purāṇas]	277-297
By Sri Anand Swarup Gupta, M. A. ; i/c. Purāṇa Deptt., Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi.	
6. The Sāṅkhyization of the Emanation Doctrine shown in a Critical Analysis of Texts [भूतसृष्टिसिद्धान्तस्य सांख्यीकरणम्, यथा तत् सृष्टिप्रकरणपाठानां समालोचनात्मके विश्लेषणे प्रदर्शितम् भवेत् ]	298-338
By Dr. P. Hacker ; Prof. of Indian Philosophy, Bonn University, West Germany.	

7. मुद्गलपुराणविषयसमालोचनम् [Review of the Topics of the  
Mudgala Purāṇa] 339-350  
By *M. M. Pt. Giridhara Sharma Chaturvedi* ;  
Dharma-Saṅgha, Varanasi.
8. The Devī-Purāṇa, a Work of Bengal [देवीपुराणम्—  
बङ्गालप्रदेशे रचितो ग्रन्थः] 351-359  
By *Dr. R. C. Haara*, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt. ;  
Professor, Research Department, Sanskrit  
College, Calcutta.
9. श्रीवराहपुराणं श्रीरामानुजसम्प्रदायश्च [The Varāha Purāṇa and  
the Rāmānuja-Sect] 360-383  
By *Pt. K. V. Nilameghacharya* ;  
Professor, Vārāṇaseya Sanskrit Viśvavidyālaya,  
Varanasi.
10. Telugu Versions of the Purāṇas [पुराणानां तेलुगु-  
रूपान्तराणि] 384-407  
By *Dr. K. V. Ramakoti Sastry*, B. A. (Hons), Ph. D. ;  
Lecturer in Telugu, Osmania University,  
Hanamkonda, Andhra State.
11. पुराण-सूक्तयः [Wise sayings from the Purāṇas] 408
12. A Sample Edition of the Matsya Purāṇa  
[मत्स्यपुराणस्य आदर्शात्मिकं संस्करणम्] 409-417  
By *Dr. V. Raghavan*, M. A., Ph. D. ;  
Professor and Head of Sanskrit Deptt.,  
Madras University.

## व्यास-वन्दना

व्यासं वसिष्ठनसारं शक्तेः पौत्रमकल्मषम् ।

पराशरात्मजं वन्दे शुक्रतातं तपोनिधिम् ॥

व्यासाय विष्णुरूपाय व्यासरूपाय विष्णवे ।

नमो वै ब्रह्मनिधये वासिष्ठाय नमो नमः ॥

( महाभा०, C.E., भोजमपर्व, पृ० ३, टि० )

ब्रह्मसूत्रकृते तस्मै वेदव्यासाय वेधसे ।

ज्ञानशक्त्यवताराय नमो भगवतो हरेः ॥

( शरीरक भाष्य, भामती, मंगलाचरणश्लोक )

यन्न्याससूत्रप्रथितात्मबोधसौरभ्यगर्भश्रुतिपद्ममाला ।

प्रसाधयत्यद्वयमात्मतत्त्वं तं व्यासमाद्यं गुरुमानतोऽस्मि ॥

( वेदान्तकल्पतत्र, मंगलाचरणश्लोक )



## व्यास-वर्णनम्

तस्य कृष्णस्य कपिलां जटां दीप्ते च लोचने ।  
वभ्रूणि चैव श्मश्रूणि दृष्ट्वा देवी न्यमीलयत् ॥

( महाभा०, १।१०६।५ )

वामे कमण्डलुं विभ्रद् दक्षिणे दण्डमुत्तमम् ।  
पिशङ्गीभिर्जटाभिश्च रानितो महसां चयः ॥

( शिवपु०, उमासं०, ४४।३६ )

एतस्मिन् समये व्यासो भस्मभूषितमस्तकः ।  
रुद्राक्षभरणश्चायात् जटाजूटविभूषितः ॥  
पञ्चाक्षरं जपन् मन्त्रं शिवप्रेमसमाकुलः ॥

( शिवपु०, शतरुद्रसं०, ४७।२२, २३ )

( रामशंकर भट्टाचार्य )

## अगस्त्यप्रोक्तं पापशमनं नाम हरिर्शंकरस्तोत्रम्

( वामनपु०, वैकटेश्वरसंस्करणं, अ० ८८, श्लो० २-२७ )

मत्स्यं नमस्ये देवेशं कूर्मं देवेशमेव<sup>१</sup> च ।  
 हयशीर्षं नमस्येऽहं भवं विष्णुं त्रिविक्रमम् ॥ २ ॥  
 नमस्ये माधवेशानौ हृषीकेशकुमारिलौ<sup>२</sup> ।  
 नारायणं नमस्येऽहं नमस्ते<sup>३</sup> गरुडासनम् ॥ ३ ॥  
 'ज्येशं नरसिंहं'<sup>४</sup> च रूपधारं<sup>५</sup> कुरुध्वजम् ।  
 कामपालमखण्डं च नमस्ये ब्राह्मणप्रियम् ॥ ४ ॥  
 अजितं विश्वकर्माणं पुण्डरीकं द्विजप्रियम् ।  
 हरिं<sup>६</sup> शंभुं नमस्ये च ब्रह्माणं सप्रजापतिम् ॥ ५ ॥  
 नमस्ये शूलबाहुं च देवं चक्रधरं तथा ।  
 शिवं विष्णुं सुवर्णाक्षं<sup>७</sup> गोपतिं पीतवाससम् ॥ ६ ॥  
 नमस्ये च गदापाणिं नमस्ये च कुशेशयम् ।  
 अर्धनारीश्वरं देवं नमस्ये पापनाशनम् ॥ ७ ॥  
 गोपालं च<sup>८</sup> सवैकुण्ठं नमस्ये चापधारिणम्<sup>९</sup> ।  
 नमस्ये विष्णुरूपं<sup>१०</sup> च 'ज्येष्ठेशं पञ्चमं तथा'<sup>११</sup> ॥ ८ ॥<sup>१२</sup>  
 उपशान्तं नमस्येऽहं मार्कण्डेयं सजम्बुकम् ।  
 नमस्ये पद्मकिरणं नमस्ये वडवासुखम् ॥ ९ ॥  
 कार्तिकेयं नमस्येऽहं बाह्लिकं<sup>१३</sup> शङ्खिनं<sup>१४</sup> तथा ।  
 नमस्ये पद्मकिरणं नमस्ये च कुशेशयम् ॥<sup>१५</sup> १० ॥

अत्र काशीराजव्यासस्य पुराणविभागे संवादितेभ्यो (Collated) वामनपुराण-  
 तोशेभ्यः केचिद् उपयोगिनः पाठमेवा निदिश्यन्ते । पाठान्तरयुतां देवनागरीलिपि-  
 तेशानां संख्याऽऽहृत्य कोष्ठेऽग्रे प्रदृश्यते, शारदालिपिकोशस्य 'शा०' इति पृथगेव निवेशः  
 क्रियते । वामनपुराणस्य संवादितकोशानां विवरणं तु 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः भाग ३,  
 पृष्ठ १, पृष्ठ १३५-१३६ स्थले प्रदत्तम् ।

१. गोविन्दमेव ( ५, शा० ) । २. कुमारिणौ ( ५, शा० ) ।  
 ३. नमस्ये ( २, शा० ) ; तथैव ( १ ) । ४. ऊर्ध्वकेशं नृसिंहं ( ४, शा० ) ।  
 ५. रूपधारिकुचं ( ५, शा० ) । ६. हंसं ( ५, शा० ) । ७. सुवर्णाक्षं ( २ ) ।  
 ८. चैव वैकुण्ठं\* ( १, शा० ) । ९. चापराजितं ( ५ ) ; त्वाभ्यपराजितं ( १, शा० ) ।  
 १०. विश्वरूपं ( ४, शा० ) । ११. सौगन्धिं सर्वदा शिवम् ( ४, शा० ) ।  
 १२. श्रष्टमश्लोकात्परं पाठोऽधिकः—'पाञ्चालिकं हयग्रीवं स्वयम्भुममरेष्वरम् । नमस्ये  
 पुष्कराक्षं च प ( अ-१, शा० ) योगन्धिं च केशवम् ॥ बाह्विभुक्तं च लोर्लं च  
 श्येष्ठेशं मध्यमं तथा । ( ५, शा० ) । १३. वा ( व-शा० ) ह्रीकं ( २ ), बाह्वीशं ( २ ) ;  
 ताल्मीकं ( १ ) । १४. शङ्खिनं ( ४, शा० ) । १५. उत्तरार्धं नास्ति ( ५ कोष्ठे ) ।

नमस्ये स्थाणुमनघं नमस्ये वनमालिनम् ।  
 नमस्ये लाङ्गलीशं च नमस्येऽहं श्रियः पतिम् ॥ ११ ॥  
 नमस्ये च त्रिनयनं नमस्ये हव्यवाहनम् ।  
 नमस्ये च त्रिसौवर्ण<sup>१९</sup> नमस्ये धरणीधरम् ॥ १२ ॥  
 त्रिणाचिकेतं ब्रह्माणं<sup>१७</sup> नमस्ये शशिमूषणम्<sup>१८</sup> ।  
 कपर्दिनं नमस्ये च सर्वाभयविनाशनम् ॥ १३ ॥  
<sup>१६</sup>नमस्ये शशिनं सूर्यं<sup>१९</sup> ध्रुवं रुद्रं<sup>२०</sup> महौजसम् ।  
 पद्मनाभं हिरण्याक्षं नमस्ये स्कन्दमव्ययम् ॥ १४ ॥  
 नमस्येऽहं भीमहंसौ नमस्ये हाटकेश्वरम् ।  
 सदाहंसं<sup>२१</sup> नमस्ये च नमस्ये घ्राणतर्पणम् ॥ १५ ॥  
 नमस्ये रुक्मकवचं महायोगिनमीश्वरम् ।  
 नमस्ये श्रीनिवासं च नमस्ये पुरुषोत्तमम् ॥ १६ ॥  
 नमस्ये च चतुर्बाहुं नमस्ये च सुधाधिपम्<sup>२२</sup> ।  
 वनस्पतिं<sup>२३</sup> मधुपतिं<sup>२४</sup> नमस्ये मनुमव्ययम्<sup>२५</sup> ॥ १७ ॥  
 श्रीकण्ठं बासुदेवं च नीलकण्ठं सदाशिवम्<sup>२६</sup> ।  
 नमस्ये शर्वमनघं<sup>२७</sup> गौरीशं लकुडेश्वरम्<sup>२८</sup> ॥ १८ ॥  
 मनोहरं च कृष्णेशं<sup>२९</sup> नमस्ये चक्रपाणिनम् ।  
 यशोधनं<sup>३०</sup> महाबाहुं नमस्ये च कुशप्रियम्<sup>३१</sup> ॥ १९ ॥  
 मूधरं छादितगदं<sup>३२</sup> सुनेत्रं<sup>३३</sup> सुरशंसितम्<sup>३४</sup> ।  
 भद्राक्षं वीरभद्रं च नमस्ये शंकुकर्णिनम्<sup>३५</sup> ॥ २० ॥  
 वृषध्वजं महेशं च विश्वामित्रं शशिप्रभम् ।  
 उपेन्द्रं च सगोविन्दं नमस्ये पङ्कजप्रियम् ॥ २१ ॥

१६. त्रिसौवर्ण (३, शा०) । १७. ब्रह्मेश (४, शा०) । १८. शक्तिमूषण (१, शा०) ।  
 १९. सर्ववैवर्ण्यं सूर्यं (१) । २०. रौद्रं (४, शा०) । २१. महाहंसं (२) । २२. ऽस्ये  
 वसुधा० (३, शा०) । २३. नमस्पति (शा०) । २४. पशुपति (४, शा०) ।  
 २५. प्रभुम० (५, शा०) । २६. सदाशिवम् (६) । २७. सर्व० (४, शा०) ।  
 २८. ल (न-२; व-१, शा०) कुलीश्वरं (१) । २९. ०रं कृष्णकेशं (४, शा०) ।  
 ३०. यशोधरं (३, शा०) । ३१. कुरेशयं (२, शा०) ; सुकेशवं (२) ।  
 ३२-३४. छादितगदं त्रिनेत्रं शूलशस्त्रिनौ (१, शा०) । ३४. शूलशस्त्रिनौ (३) ;  
 वृषध्वजिनम् (२) । ३५. शंकुकर्णकम् (२, शा०) , ंकर्षणम् (२) ।

सहस्रशिरसं देवं नमस्ये कुन्दमालिनम् ।  
<sup>३३</sup>कालाभि रुद्रदेवेशं<sup>३६</sup> नमस्ये कृत्तिशसम् ॥ २२ ॥  
 नमस्ये छागलेशं च नमस्ये पङ्कजासनम् ।  
 सहस्राक्षं कोकनदं नमस्ये हरिशंकरम् ॥ २३ ॥  
 अगस्त्यं गरुडं विष्णुं कपिलं ब्रह्मवाङ्मयम् ।  
 सनातनं च ब्रह्माणं नमस्ये ब्रह्म तत्परम् ॥ २४ ॥  
 अप्रतर्क्यं चतुर्बाहुं सहस्रांशुं तपोमयम् ।  
 नमस्ये धर्मराजानं देवं गरुडवाहनम् ॥ २५ ॥  
 सर्वभूतगतं शान्तं निर्मलं सर्वलक्षणम् ।  
 महायोगिनमव्यक्तं नमस्ये पापनाशनम् ॥ २६ ॥  
 निरञ्जनं निराकारं निर्गुणं निलयं<sup>३७</sup> पदम् ।  
 नमस्ये पापहर्तारं शरण्यं शरणं ब्रजे ॥ २७ ॥

[ एतत् पवित्रं परमं पुराण प्रोक्तं स्वगस्त्येन महर्षिणा च ।  
 धन्यं यशस्यं बहुपापनाशनं संकीर्तनात् स्मरणात् स्पर्शनाच्च<sup>३८</sup> ॥ २८ ॥<sup>३९</sup>

३६. कालाभिरुद्रं देवेशं ( ४, शा० ) । ३७. निर्मलं ( २, शा० ) ; निर्ममं ( १ ) ;  
 ३८ स्मरणात् संश्रवाच्च ( १ ) ; संस्मरणाश्चवाच्च ( १ ) ; स्मरणात् सेवनाच्च ( १,  
 शा० ) ; श्रवणात् स्मरणाच्च ( १ ) । ३९. अयं श्लोको न विद्यते ( १ कोशे ) ।

टि० ८. वैकुण्ठं, अत्र तुलनार्थं द्रष्टव्यम्—

नरो नारायणश्चैव सर्वज्ञः सर्वभूतभृत् ।

देवा वैकुण्ठ इत्याहुर् वेदा विष्णुरिति प्रभुम् ॥

( महाभा०, C. E., श्रीष्मपर्व, ६. २१ )

'वैकुण्ठ (cf. VI. 9. 21c; 6. 21-15b) is a personal name and not a place name, as it became in later literature.'

(Mbh., C. E., Bhīṣma Parvan, Appendix)

( आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त )

# भारतीयराजनीतौ पुराणपञ्चलक्षणम्

पं० राजेश्वरशास्त्री द्विविड

[It has been generally held by Indologists that the five characteristics of the Purāṇas (*sarga*, *pratisarga* etc), which have been mentioned in the Amarakośa (circa 5th century A. C.), as well as in some of the Purāṇas, had originally formed the main subject-matter of the Purāṇas, and that the religious topics were added to them afterwards. But in this article the author brings to light an altogether different *pañcalakṣaṇa*-definition of the Purāṇas, quoted in the *Jayamāṅgalā* commentary of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. This definition mentions *dharma* as one of the five characteristics of the Purāṇas, and so it differs from the well-known classical *pañcalakṣaṇa*-definition. It has not yet been traced in any of the Purāṇas, and so it may be said to represent a different tradition of the *Purāṇa-pañcalakṣaṇa*, which might have been contained in some old works of the Paurāṇika-school. The quotation of this *pañcalakṣaṇa* definition, which had probably sunk into oblivion, may be said to be a valuable contribution of the *Jayamāṅgalā*, the famous work on ancient Indian politics, to the Purāṇic thoughts.

On the strength of this definition of the Purāṇa, the learned writer has shown here that the *dharmaśāstra*-material, though forming a secondary topic in the Purāṇas was, nevertheless, originally included in them, and not interpolated later on.

The writer has also examined the views of some of the modern Indologists on the *pañcalakṣaṇa*-defini-

tion of the Purāṇas. In his opinion the sense of the *Amarakośa-definition* must conform to the sense of the *Jayamañgalā-definition*, and so the word '*Munvantara*' in the *Amarakośa-definition* should be explained as to include in it the topic of *dharma* also, as the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* has already explained it by the words 'मन्वन्तराणि सद्धर्मः' (2. 1. 3)

In the end the author has stressed the need of studying the works on the *Rājaniiti* for properly editing and interpreting the Purāṇas.]

“पुराणन्यायमीमांसा धर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।

वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥” ( या. सू. ब्रा. ३ )

इति याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृत्युक्त्यनुसारेण पुराणानां धर्मप्रतिपादकत्वं परम्परागतं खरसम्प्रदायसिद्धमिति सर्वे जानन्ति । न केवलमस्मदीयसस्सम्प्रदायसिद्धमेतदपि तु बौद्धजयमङ्गलादिकृद्विवेचनेऽप्ययमंशः प्रमाणितो भवति । तथाहि तत्रत्यो ग्रन्थः—

“कः पुनरितिहास इत्याह पुराणमिति । सृष्ट्यादिज्ञानफलम् । तथा चोक्तम्—

“सृष्टिप्रवृत्तिसंहारधर्ममोक्षप्रयोजनम् ।

ब्रह्मभिर्विविधैः प्रोक्तं पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥” इति ।

( कौ. अ. १-५ व्याख्या जयमङ्गला )

अनेन हि ग्रन्थेन धर्मविज्ञानमपि पुराणपञ्चलक्षणान्तर्गतमेकं लक्षणमिति प्रतीयते । एतदविरोध्येव याज्ञवल्क्यवचनं पुराणानां धर्मस्थानत्वं प्रतिपादयति । किम्बहुना ? “सृष्टिप्रवृत्तिसंहारे”त्युक्ते वचने स्थितिपर्यायायाः प्रवृत्तेरुपादाना-  
द्व्यावहारिकाणां विषयाणामपि प्रतिपादनं तत्र युज्यते इति स्फुटम् ।

“भूतमात्रेन्द्रियधियां जन्म सर्ग उदाहृतः ।

ब्रह्मणो गुणवैषम्याद्विसर्गः पौरुषः स्मृतः ॥

स्थितिर्वैकुण्ठविजयः पोषणं तदनुग्रहः ।

मन्वन्तराणि सद्धर्म उक्तयः कर्मवासनाः ॥” ( भाग. २, १-३ )

इति श्रीमद्भागवतेऽपि पुराणस्य पञ्चलक्षणान्तर्गतो मन्वन्तरभागः सद्धर्म इत्युक्त्या पुराणानां धर्मप्रतिपादकत्वं व्यवस्थाप्यते । अतोऽस्त्येव पुराणेष्वपि धर्मशास्त्रस्यान्तर्भाव इति सिद्ध्यति ।

कथं तर्हि याज्ञवल्क्यवचने धर्मशास्त्राणां पुराणेभ्यः पृथग्गणनमिति प्रश्नस्त्वत्रानुचितः । प्रसङ्गाद्धर्मप्रतिपादनस्यैव पुराणविषयत्वात् प्राधान्येन धर्मशास्त्रस्म धर्मप्रतिपादनविषयत्वेनाविरोधात् । “तत्त्वमसौ”ति वाक्यघटकत्वम्पदार्थकर्मकर्तृजीवस्वरूपविशुद्ध्यर्थं धर्मशास्त्राणां, तत्पदार्थेशस्वरूपविशुद्ध्यर्थं पुराणानां प्राधान्येन प्रवृत्तिरिति हि सिद्धान्तो माधवाचार्यैः सूतसंहितान्तर्गतस्य—

“ब्रह्मा सर्वजगत्कर्ता शिवस्य परमात्मनः ।

प्रसादादेव रुद्रस्य स्मृतीः सस्मार सुव्रतः ॥” (सूतसं. १, ४१)

इति श्लोकस्य व्याख्यानावसरे निर्णीतः । तद्यथाः—

“वेदे हि द्वौ भागौ कर्मभागो ज्ञानभागश्चेति । आद्यस्यार्थः स्मृतिमुखेन ब्रह्मणा शिवाज्ञैव व्याख्यातः । द्वितीयस्य तु विष्णुना व्यासरूपेणावतीर्थं पुराणमुखेनेति स्मृतिपुराणानां वेदमूलता न स्वातन्त्र्यमित्यर्थः ।

यद्यपि स्मृतिपत्रपि विद्यानिरूपणमस्ति, तथापि तत्प्रासङ्गिकद्रव्यशुद्धिप्रसङ्गेन हि कथितम् “क्षेत्रज्ञस्येश्वरज्ञानाद्विशुद्धिः परमा मता” इति । चतुर्थाश्रमधर्मप्रसङ्गेन चोपनिषदतत्त्वनिरूपणं कृतमिति । पुराणानां तु विद्याप्राधान्यम्, प्रासङ्गिकं कर्मनिरूपणम् । पुराणेषु हि जगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिलयकारणत्वं शिवस्याभिप्रेत्योत्पत्ति कारणत्वं सर्गेणोक्तम् । लयकारणत्वं च प्रतिसर्गेण । स्थितिकारणत्वं च वंशमन्वन्तरवंशानुचरितनिरूपणेन । तत्प्रसङ्गादाश्रमधर्मा आगता इति । अतएव धर्मविषये स्मृतिपुराणविप्रतिषेधौ स्मृतीनां प्राबल्यं तत्र तासां तात्पर्यत इति, तत्त्वज्ञानविषये पुराणप्राबल्यमिति विवेकः ।” इति ।

इह केचिदाधुनिका इतिहाससंशोधका आहुः—

“पुराणानि स्वप्राचीनतमस्वरूपे केषां केषां विषयाणां प्रतिपादकान्यासन्निति न निश्चयेन वक्तुं शक्यते । अमरकोशस्य, वर्तमानानामनेकेषां पुराणानां चानुसारेण

पुराणेषु सर्गाः, प्रतिसर्गाः, वंशः, मन्वन्तराणि; वंशानुचरितं चेति पञ्चविषया आवश्यकः। एतेषां पञ्चानामपि लक्षणानां मूलम् आख्यानम्, उपाख्यानम्, गाथा, कल्पोक्तिश्चेति चतुष्टयमेव। ब्रह्माण्ड. २-३४-२१, वायु. ६०-२१, विष्णु. ३-६-१६, एतेषां वचनानामनुसारेण महर्षिर्व्यासः उक्तचतुष्टयमवलम्ब्यैव पुराणसंहितां रचयामासेति सिद्ध्यति। अतः पुराणैः स्वप्राचीनस्वरूपे सर्गादिपञ्चविषयाणामेव प्राधान्येन वर्णनं क्रियते स्मेत्यत्र नास्ति सन्देहः। परन्तु वर्तमानेषु पुराणग्रन्थेषु एतेषां विषयाणां कचित्पूर्णतया कचिदंशतश्चोपेक्षा कृता वर्तते। धार्मिकेभ्यः सामाजिकेभ्यश्च विषयेभ्योऽत्यन्तं महत्त्वं दत्तमित्युपलभ्यते। येषु पुराणेषूक्तलक्षणानां पूर्णतयाऽशतो वा वर्णनं दृश्यते, तेष्वपि धार्मिकाणां स्मार्तानां च विषयाणां वर्णनमस्तीति”

( हाजरा, पुराणिक रिकार्ड्स पृ० ४-५ )

“यदा धार्मिकेषु स्मार्तेषु च विषयेषु पुराणानां प्रामाण्यमङ्गीकृतम् तदा पुराणानां मुख्यविषयेषु पञ्चसु लक्षणेषु लोकानां धारणा एतादृशी सम्पन्ना, यत्-एतानि पञ्च लक्षणानि केवलमुपपुराणानामेव, महापुराणानां तु दशलक्षणान्यावश्यकानि, येषु धार्मिकाणां स्मार्तानां च विषयाणां प्राधान्यं स्यादिति। अतो राज्ञां ऋषीणां च वंशं वंशानुचरितं च प्रति विशेषतोऽवधानं न कृतम्। एवं, वंशं वंशानुचरितं च शुद्धया ऐतिहासिकदृष्ट्या न लिखित्वा प्रायः कल्पनैवाश्रितेति”

( हाजरा, पु० रि. पृ. ७ )

“अमरकोशस्थानेकेषां पुराणानां चानुसारेण सर्गादयः पञ्चैव पुराणानां विषयाः। “वंशानुचरित”मित्यत्र “भूम्यादेः संस्थान”मिति पाठोऽप्युपलभ्यते, यस्यार्थः, “पौराणिको भुवनकोश” इति। परन्तु वर्तमानेषु पुराणेषु यत्किमपि, पुराणमेतस्याः पञ्चलक्षणरूपायाः परिभाषाया अनुसरणं पूर्णतया न करोति। केषुचित्पुराणेषु पञ्चलक्षणापेक्षयाऽधिका एव विषयाः उपलभ्यन्ते। केषुचिच्चैतेषां पञ्चविषयाणां किमपि वर्णनं नोपलभ्यते। प्रत्युत एतत्स्थानेऽन्येषामेव विषयाणां विस्तारो दृश्यते। किं च, वर्तमानकाले उपलब्धेषु पुराणेषु चत्वारिंशच्चर्मोऽंश (१।४०) एवोक्तलक्षणप्रतिपादकः। एतेनेदं सिद्ध्यति, यत्—प्राचीनपुराणानां मुख्यः प्रतिपाद्यो विषयो धर्मोपदेशो



नासीत्, तानि च मूलस्वरूपे साम्प्रदायिकभावनया न रचितान्यासन्निति । वर्तमानपुराणेषु हि दान-व्रत-तीर्थ-श्राद्धादिधार्मिकविषया एव मुख्यसामग्रीत्वेन वर्तन्ते, ये खलुक्तपञ्चलक्षणेष्वन्तर्गता न भवन्ति, पुराणानां पञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषां चावास्तविकतया केवलं सैद्धान्तिकीं कुर्वन्ति । अतः इमां दुरवस्थामपनेतुं पुराणेष्वेवायं सिद्धान्तः स्थापितो यत्—पञ्चलक्षणानि केवलमुपपुराणानाम्, मुख्यपुराणपरिभाषा तु दशलक्षणरूपा, यस्यां प्रवृत्तिः, रक्षा, मुक्तिः, हेतुः, अपाश्रयश्चेति धार्मिकविषया अप्यन्तर्गता भवन्ति । वर्तमानपुराणस्थाः केचन विषयाः पुनर्दशलक्षणेष्वपि नान्तर्भवन्ति । मत्स्यपुराणानुसारेण तु ब्रह्म-विष्णु-शिव-सूर्यादीनां माहात्म्यवर्णनं, धर्मार्थकाममोक्षप्रतिपादनं चोक्त-लक्षणातिरिक्तः पुराणानां विषयो वर्तते इति”

( पुसालकर, स्टडीज इन एपिक्स एण्ड दी पुराण, भूमिका, पृ० ४५-४६ )

“प्रसिद्धसंस्कृतकोशभूते अमरकोशे, अनेकेषु पुराणेषु च पुराणानां पञ्चलक्षणान्युक्तानि । परन्तु “किरफिल”महोदयेनैतत्प्रदर्शितम्, यत्—पञ्चलक्षणानि तु पुराणानां चत्वारिंशत्तमांशरूपाण्येव भवन्ति । अतोऽवशिष्टानामेकोनचत्वारिंशदंशानाममरकोशानुसारेण पुराणत्वं न सिद्ध्यतीत्यं परिभाषा न युक्ता । पुराणानां मुख्यं लक्षणमिदमेव यत्पुरातनत्वम्, अतो यः कोऽपि पुरातनो विषयः पुराणप्रतिपाद्यो भवितुमर्हति । एवं च जीवनविषयकः सर्वोऽपि पक्षः पुराणान्तर्गतो भवतीति ।

श्रीमद्भागवते पुराणानां दश लक्षणान्युक्तानि । किन्त्विमान्यपि चतुर्लक्षश्लोकपरिमितेषु पुराणेषु सम्पूर्णतया व्याप्तानि न भवन्ति । मत्स्य-पुराणस्थिता पुराणपरिभाषा तु बुद्धिसङ्गता वर्तते । तदनुसारेण सर्वेषु पुराणेषु सर्गादिपञ्चविषयातिरिक्ततया ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवार्कादीनां माहात्म्यस्य, संसारस्थितिसंहारयोर्धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणां च वर्णनमावश्यकं तद्विरुद्धविषयाणां च । पुराणप्रतिपाद्यविषयविषयकं पुराणस्थमेवेदं वचनं यद्यप्यधिकतया-व्यापकं भवति, तथापि पुराणस्थान् सर्वानपि विषयाञ्च व्याप्नोतीति”

( हरप्रसादशास्त्री, एशियाटिक सोसाइटी संस्कृत केटलॉग, भाग ५, भूमिका )

“वर्तमानपुराणानि पुराणनामयोग्यानि प्राचीनपुराणानि न सन्तीतीदं तथ्यं वर्तमानपुराणेषु यत्किमपि पुराणं पुराणोक्ताया एव पञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषाया अनुसरणं न करोतीत्यनेन प्रमाणितं भवति । प्राचीनपरिभाषामनुसृत्य प्रत्येकस्मिन् पुराणे सर्गः, प्रतिसर्गः, वंशः, मन्वन्तराणि, वंशानुचरितम्, अर्थात्—सूर्यवंशीयानां वा राज्ञां चरितं चेति पञ्च लक्षणान्यावश्यकानि । वर्तमानकाले यानि पुराणान्युपलब्धानि, तत्रोक्तपञ्चलक्षणात्मकस्त्वांशिक एव विषयो वर्तते । केषुचित्पुराणेष्वेतदपेक्षयाऽधिका एव विषयाः सन्ति । कानिचन पुराणान्येतेषां स्पर्शमपि न कुर्वन्ति । सर्वथा भिन्ना एव विषयास्तत्र निरूप्यन्ते । प्रायः सर्वेषां वर्तमानपुराणानां विषये विशेषरूपेणोल्लेखनीयोऽयं विषयो यदेतेषां साम्प्रदायिकनास्वरूपम्, अर्थात्—विष्णुशिवादिदेवेषु केनचित्सम्बद्धता, यस्याः प्राचीनपञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषया पूर्णतयोपेक्षा कृता वर्तते ।

येषु पुराणेषु प्राचीनस्वरूपं केनचिदंशेन सुरक्षितमस्ति, तेषु सृष्टिरचनायाः, आद्यकालीनेतिहासस्य च प्रकरणान्युपलभ्यन्ते । एवं पञ्चलक्षणपरिभाषानुसारेण मूलभूतयोः सूर्यचन्द्रयोर्वंशीयानां महाभारतकालीन-वीरपर्यन्तानां प्राचीनानां राज्ञां वंशावल्यापि तत्रोपलभ्यते इति”

( विंटरनिट्ज, हिस्ट्री आफ इण्डियन लिटरेचर, पृ० ५२२-३ )

अनेकेषु पुराणेषु प्रसिद्धेषु कोशेषु चोपलब्धायाः परिभाषाया अनुसारेण पुराणानां पञ्च लक्षणानि भवन्ति, सर्गः प्रतिसर्गःमन्वन्तराणि प्राचीनराजवंशावली तथा वंशावलीस्थव्यक्तीनां चरितं चेति । यद्यपि—वर्तमानकाले उपलब्धेषु पुराणेषु यत्किमपि पुराणमेतस्याः परिभाषाया अक्षरशोऽनुसरणं न करोति, तथाप्यनेकेषु पुराणेष्विमानि पञ्चलक्षणानि बीजरूपेण सुरक्षितानि सन्तीति—

( घोषाल, स्टडीज् इन इण्डियन हिस्ट्री एण्ड कल्चर, पृ० ५१ )

अत्र ब्रूमः—

“सृष्टिप्रवृत्तिसंहारधर्ममोक्षप्रयोजनम् ।

ब्रह्मभिर्विविधैः प्रोक्तं पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥” (कौटि० १-५, व्याख्या)

इत्यर्थशास्त्रजयमङ्गलोद्धृतस्य पूर्वोक्तवचनस्यामरकोशकर्तृसमकालिककौटिल्यकृतार्थशास्त्रीयपुराणपदार्थप्रतिपादकस्य तत्पूर्वतनव्याख्यापरम्परागतस्योपलभ्यमानत्वेनामरकोशगतपञ्चलक्षणपदस्यापि तादृशार्थपरत्वे नास्त्येव शङ्कावकाशः ।

“सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।”

इति वाक्यस्यापि “मन्वन्तराणि सद्धर्म” इति वचनप्रामाण्येन तादृशार्थप्रतिपादकत्वमिति स्फुटं प्रतीयते । स्पष्टोक्तोऽयमर्थ उपक्रमे एवास्माभिः ।

एवं सति ब्राधुनिकैरितिहाससंशोधकैः राजनीतिशास्त्रस्यापर्यालोचनेनासूययेव कृता एते सर्वेऽप्याक्षेपा अश्रद्धया एव ।

तथाहिः—यदुच्यते—आख्यानम्, उपाख्यानम्, गाथा, कल्पोक्तिश्चेति चतुष्टयमेवैतेषां पञ्चलक्षणानां मूलमिति, तत्र पुराणस्थानामाख्यानादीनां मूलत्वमपेक्षितं वा वेदादिस्थानामाख्यानामिति प्रथममालोचनीयतामर्हति । आद्यपक्षे स्फुट एवात्माश्रयदोषः । द्वितीयपक्षस्तु इष्यत एव ।

“यद्ब्राह्मणानीतिहासान् पुराणानि कल्पा गाथानाराशंसी”रिति

(तै० ब्रा० २-६ अ०)

वेदवाक्यं भाष्यकृता एवं व्याख्यातम् ।

“इतिहासा महाभारतादयः, पुराणानि ब्रह्माण्डादीनि, यद्वा “देवासुरा, संयत्ता आस”न्नित्यादय इतिहासा, “आत्मा वा इदमेक एवात्र आसीन्नान्यत्किञ्चन मिष”दिति सृष्ट्यादिप्रतिपादकानि पुराणानि । कल्पा, कल्पसूत्राणि प्रयोगप्रतिपादकानि, गाथाः—गायतिचोदिता मन्त्रविशेषाः “योऽस्यकोष्ठ्ये”त्यादयः, यमगाथाभिः परिगायतीति विधानात् । नाराशंसशब्दोपेता नाराशंस्यः “होता-यक्षन्नाराशंस”मित्याद्याः मन्त्रब्राह्मणान्तःपठितानामपि पुनरुक्तिः फलतिशय-द्योतनार्थमिति ।

अत्र हि पुराणशब्दस्य व्याख्यायां सृष्ट्यादिप्रतिपादकानीति वदता भाष्यकृता “सृष्टिप्रवृत्ती”ति पूर्वोद्धृतजयमङ्गलोक्तवचनमेव स्मर्यते राजनीतिगत-

त्वात् । “सर्गश्चे” त्यादिवचनस्य स्मरणे सति सर्गादिप्रतिपादकानोत्प्रेयोच्येतेति विशेषः स्फुटः ।

कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रेऽपि—“पश्चिममितिहासश्रवणेषु पुराणमिति वृत्तमाख्या-  
यिकोदाहरणं धर्मशास्त्रमर्थशास्त्रं चेतिहासाः” इति ।

अत्र भारतीभवनप्रकाशितेऽर्थशास्त्रे कौटिलीये आख्यायिकोदाहरणम्—

“असम्भूतकथावाक्यमुक्तप्रत्युत्तरान्वितम् ।

निदर्शनार्थमन्येषामुदाहरणमिष्यते ॥”

यथा तन्त्रपञ्चकादि । इति प्राचीनटिप्पणमुद्धृतं दृश्यते ।

जयमङ्गलाकृतापि आख्यायिकोदाहरणं “वर्जनसेवनफलं तन्त्राख्यायिकादि ।”  
इत्यादि वदता उक्तटिप्पणस्यैवार्थोऽनुमोदितः ।

एवंविधानामाख्यायिकानां पुराणमूलत्वमितिहासमूलत्वं चोदाहरणरूपत्वेनैव  
भवतीति स्पष्टोऽर्थः । पूर्वोक्तपुराणलक्षणप्रतिपादके “सृष्टिप्रवृत्ती” त्यादिवचने  
स्थितिपर्यायायाः प्रवृत्तेरपि प्रतिपाद्यत्वावगमाज्जागत्परिपालनविषया अन्ये सर्वेऽपि  
धातुवादादयः पुराणेतिहासान्तर्गता भवन्ति । स्त्रीशूद्रादिसर्वसाधारणेषु श्रान्यत्वो-  
पयुक्तया रचनया तर्हि महदुपकृतं पुराणैर्लोकस्येति स्थितौ सत्यां तदुपरि  
संशयगर्भिताया दृष्टेर्निक्षेपणं त्वसूयाकल्पितमिव भवति ।

एतेन “वंशानुचरित”मित्यत्र “भूम्यादेः संस्थान”मिति पाठान्तरं  
वर्णयित्वा आक्षेपोद्भावनमप्ययुक्तमेव । लोकोपयुक्तस्य सर्वस्यैवज्ञानस्य पूर्वोक्तरीत्या  
पुराणेन वर्णनीयत्वे सिद्धे ज्ञानकोशरूपेषु पुराणेषु सर्वस्यैवांशस्यावकाशसत्त्वाद्दु-  
भयोरेव पाठयोः प्रामाण्योपपत्तेः । भागवतोक्तदशलक्षणान्यपि पूर्वोक्तपञ्चलक्षणा-  
विरोधीन्येव । न ह्येकस्मिन् लक्षणे स्थितेऽन्यानि लक्षणानि न सम्भवन्तीति  
कश्चन नियमः । न्यायशास्त्रे—

“वर्णः शुक्लो रसस्पर्शौ जले मधुरशीतलौ ।

स्नेहस्तत्र द्रवत्वं तु सांसिद्धिकमुदाहृतम् ॥” (भाषा० ३९)

इत्यादिना बहूनां लक्षणानां वर्ण्यमानत्वस्य दर्शनात् ।

प्रयोजनं हि बहूनां लक्षणानां, सर्वत्र सर्वेषां लक्षणानामप्राप्तावपि केनचि-  
देकेनापि लक्ष्यनिर्णयः । तथा पञ्चलक्षणैर्दशलक्षणैर्वा का नामानुपपत्ति-  
निष्प्रयोजनता वेति नैव वक्तुं शक्यम् । दशलक्षणवर्जितानामपि पुराणत्वख्यापनाय  
पञ्चलक्षणस्यावश्यकत्वात् ।

अत्रेदमवधेयम् :—राजनीतिशास्त्रं प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणत्रयनिर्णीतार्थप्रतिपाद-  
कमिति पूर्वमेव ( 'पुराणम्' पत्रिका, भाग ३, अंक १, पृष्ठ ७२-९१ स्थले )  
प्रतिपादितम् । राजप्रकृतिसमवेततयैव कार्यकारित्वाद्वाजनिर्णयरूपमेव तदिति  
दृढनिर्णयेन वक्तुं शक्यते । एवं सति न्यायालयनिर्णयतुल्ययोगक्षेपेषु राजनीति-  
सिद्धान्तेषु सर्वैः शिष्टैरेकवाक्यतया परिगृहीतेषु सत्सु तानदृष्ट्वा इतिहातसंशोधनं  
विशेषतः प्राचीनवाक्येषु पुराणादिषु शङ्काविक्षरणं खेदायैव सहृदयानां  
भवति इति ।

THE GEOGRAPHICAL TEXT OF THE PURĀṆAS  
A FURTHER CRITICAL STUDY.

By

C. A. LEWIS,

(Continued from Vol. IV, No. 1)

[ अयं लेखः 'पुराण' पत्रिकायाः पूर्वस्मिन्नङ्के ( भाग ४, अंक १ ) प्रकाशितस्य श्री लैविस महोदयेन लिखितस्य पुराणभुवन-कोशसम्बन्धिनो लेखस्यावशिष्टांशः । पुराणानां भुवनकोशप्रकरणेषु मध्यदेश-उत्तरापथ-प्राच्य-दक्षिणापथ-अपरान्त-विन्ध्य-हिमालय-वर्तिनां सप्तानां जनपदानां वर्णनमुपलभ्यते । तत्र पूर्वस्मिन्नङ्के प्रकाशिते लेखांशे आद्यानां त्रयाणां — मध्यदेश-उत्तरापथ-प्राच्य-वर्तिनां — जनपदानां पुराण-कृतं वर्णनं समालोचितम् । पूर्वतोऽनुवृत्तेऽस्मिन्नंशे च शेषाणां चतुर्णां — दक्षिणापथ-अपरान्त-विन्ध्य-हिमालय-वर्तिनां — जनपदानां वर्णनं समी-क्षितम् । पूर्ववदेव चात्रापि किरफिलमहोदयेन निर्णीतस्य पाठस्य दिनेशचन्द्रसरकारमहोदयेन च स्वीकृतस्य पाठस्य समालोचनां विषय एषां जनपदानां स्थित्यादिविषये सम्भावितशुद्धपाठस्य च विषये युक्तिपुरःसरं स्वमतमपि प्रदर्शितम् । ]

DAKṢIṆĀCĀTHA

**Kirfel's text,**

athāpare janapadā Dakṣiṇāpathavāsinaḥ  
Pāṇḍyās ca Keralās caiva Colāḥ Kūlyās tathaiva ca  
Setukā Mūṣikās caiva Kumānā Vanavāsikāḥ  
Mahārāṣṭrā Māhiṣikāḥ Kālīṅgās caiva sarvaśaḥ  
Ābhīrās ca Sahaṣikā Āṭavyāḥ Śabarās tathā  
Pulindā Vindhyamauliyā Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakāḥ saha  
Paurikā Maulikās caiva Āśmakā Bhogavardhanāḥ  
Nairṇikāḥ Kuntalās Āndhrā Udbhidā Nalakalikāḥ  
dākṣiṇātyās ca vai deśā.....

**Sircar's text.**

athāpare janapadā dakṣiṇāpathavāsinaḥ  
Pāṇḍyās ca Keralās caiva Colāḥ Kūlyās tathaiva ca

Setukā Mūṣikāś caiva Kumārā Vanavāsakāḥ  
 Mahārāṣṭrā Māhiṣakāḥ Kalṅgāś caiva sarvaśaḥ  
 Kāverāḥ saha Caiṣikā Āṭavyāḥ Śabarāś ca ye  
 Pulindā Vindhyaṃulikā (yā) Vidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha  
 Paurikā Maulikā (Maulakā)-ś caiva Aśmakā Bhogavar-  
 dhanāḥ  
 Nai (R-) śikāḥ Kuntalā Āndhrā Udbhidā Nalakālikāḥ  
 (-lūpāḥ)  
 dākṣiṇātyāś ca vai deśā.....

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations.

(1) K. Kumana. S. Kumāra; (2) K. Vanavāsika. S. Vanavāsaka; (3) K. Ābhira. S. Kāvera; (4) K. Sahaiṣika. S. Caiṣika; (5) K. Vindhyaṃauliya. S. Vindhyaṃulika (ya); (6) K. Maulika. S. ? Maulaka; (7) K. Nairnika. S. Naiṣika / ? Rṣika; (8) K. Nalakālika S. ? Nalakālūpa. Of these nos. 2, and 5, are obviously variants of the same name and accordingly do not require further discussion. Kirfel's forms seem preferable in both cases.

(1) Kumana / Kumāra. Sircar's text is almost certainly correct, for the Kumāras may be easily identified with the inhabitants of Cape Comorin at the extreme southernmost tip of India. Such an identification would exactly suit the area required by the two preceding names, Setuka (Adam's Bridge) and Mūṣika (the southern part of the Malabar coast). Kirfel in his Bhāratavarṣa originally also adopted the form, Kumāra.

(3) Ābhira / Kāvera. The problem here in determining the original name is rather an unusual one; in this instance both names are well established by numerous other texts, so that the usual boggy of textual corruption does not arise. Moreover as both the Ābhīras and the Kāveras are definitely to be included in the Southern Region, a choice between the two is extremely difficult to make. The former were originally a N-W tribe between the Indus and the Sarasvatī, and were closely associated with the Śūdras. By the first century A. D. however,

they had migrated further south to the area of Gujarat around the mouth of the Narmadā. Ptolemy and the Periplus refer to this region by the name of Aberia. The Brhatsamhitā clearly indicates that the Ābhīras had two branches, one in the S-W and one in the South, which is associated with the Konkāṇas. The Kāśyapa Samhitā also confirms their location in the South. The Kāveras must of course be identified with the inhabitants of the banks of the Kāverī River, whose location in the South is obvious. There is accordingly abundant evidence for the location of both in Dakṣiṇāpatha. The only way therefore of determining the question is to consider the position of the other tribes mentioned in the same line. These are the Mahārāṣṭras (mod. Marāṭha country between the upper Godāvarī and Kṛṣṇā rivers), the Mahiṣikas, the inhabitants of the area around Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māndhātā on the Narmadā), Kaliṅgas (mod. Puri and Ganjam Dists. of Orissa), Āṭavyas and Śabaras (mod. Sams of Ganjam Dist.). Among these tribes it is far easier to place the Ābhīras of Southern Gujarat than the Kāveras of the extreme south. It is evident that the extreme south has already been described in the opening śloka from Pāṇḍya to Vanavāsī; now it is the northern areas of Dakṣiṇāpatha which are being described. Accordingly, Ābbīra seems the preferable reading.

(4) Sahaṣika/Caiṣika. Both Kirfel's and Sircars's readings, though different in form, refer to a tribe called the Eṣika, the former compounding it with saha and the latter with ca. The most valuable evidence in helping one to determine the original text at this point is supplied by the Vijayantī, which mentions the Iṣikas as a tribe of Dakṣiṇāpatha along with the Śabarārattas. That this section is a direct quotation from a Purāṇic source may be proved from its striking similarity with the actual texts now under discussion. Compare :

Vaij. 37-34. Iṣikāḥ Śabarārattāḥ  
 Vāyu. 45-126. Caiṣikā Āṭavyāḥ Śabara  
 Mats. 114-48. Sahaṣikā Āṭavyāḥ Śabara  
 Mārķ. 57-47. Vaiṣikya Āḍhakyāḥ Śabara



The question now arises as to the identity of these Iṣikas. This has been explained by Moti Chandra (J.U.P.H.S. Dec. 1943 p. 24) as a Prakrit form of Sanskrit Ṛṣika. According to the same authority, both these forms are given as alternatives at MB. 2.24.23-4, where the northern digvijaya of Arjuna is being described. If this association is accepted, the next question that arises is whether the Ṛṣikas are ever to be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. Independent evidence of such a location can be derived from the Kūrma-vibhāga<sup>30</sup> sections of the Bṛhat-saṃhitā and the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa and also from the Kiṣkin-dhā-kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa. There is thus decisive evidence for two separate branches of Ṛṣikas, one in the North as indicated by the Mahā-bhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, and the other in the South, as proved by the Purāṇic texts, the Kūrma-vibhāga list and the Rāmāyaṇa. Accordingly the form Iṣika (i.e. the Prakrit form of Ṛṣika) is the reading to be adopted here.

(6) Maulika / ? Maulaka. Sircar's emendation to Maulaka is almost certainly correct. The mūlakas are well known for their close association with the Aśmakas who later absorbed them. In the Nasik record of queen Gautamī Balaśrī (EI. VIII. 61), mention is made of Asaka (i. e. Aśmaka) immediately before Mūlaka, while Purāṇic traditions attribute the foundation of these two kingdoms to Ikṣvāku chiefs.

(7) Nairṇika / Naiṣika ? Ṛṣika. The original reading here is very uncertain. The corresponding texts of the geographical section of the Mahā-bhārata includes the variants Jhillika, Nillika, Kuḍaya and Karnika, while the Brahmāṇḍa and<sup>31</sup> Brahma-purāṇas read Nestika and Kaulika respectively. None of these forms provides any immediate solution to the difficulty however. At first sight the most plausible reading is Naiṣika, which one is at once tempted to identify with modern Nasik. As long as we limit our investigation to the peoples of Dakṣiṇāpatha, this appears to be a probable solution, for Nasik is located in the south by both Rājasekhara and the

30. BS. XIV. 15, Mārka, 58.27 ; R. Kiṣ (B). 41.10. (N.W.) 33.12.

31. Bq. I. 16. 59, Br. 27. 57,

Kūrma-vibhāga texts. There is one major obstacle to such an identification however. If, we examine, as we shortly will, the Purāṇic lists of Aparānta peoples, we find among them the Nāsikyās, who are associated with the Antara-or Uttara-Narmadas, the Bharukacchas (i. e. the inhabitants of mod. Baroach), and the Māheyas (the peoples along the banks of the Mahī). As all these places are not far from Nasik, it would seem preferable to include Nāsikya in Aparānta-deśa rather than in Dakṣiṇāpatha, though in actual fact the position of Nasik is so ambiguous geographically that it may easily be incorporated into either region by a slight change of the boundary line separating them. This uncertainty is reflected in the Kūrma-vibhāga texts. While the Brhatsamhitā and the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa locate Nāsikya in the South, the Pariśiṣṭa to the Atharva-veda (LVI. 6.) places it in the South-west. The environment in which it is placed by the latter text is of considerable significance as it corresponds to a great degree with the position assigned to Nāsikya in Aparānta-deśa by the Purāṇic texts. Compare :

Purāṇa—

Nāsikyādyāś ca ye cānye ye caivottaranarmadāḥ  
Bhārūkacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ...

Pariśiṣṭa—

Nāsikya-Karmanoyāṇi-Māhī-Narmadā...

Except for the interpolation of the unknown Karmanoyani in the Pariśiṣṭa text, the environment in both cases is identical. Accordingly, the location of Nāsikya in the western division is much more probable. Furthermore its inclusion in Dakṣiṇāpatha by Rājaśekhara<sup>32</sup> and the Kūrma-vibhāga lists can be easily explained by an analysis of the structure of these texts. Rājaśekhara distinctly specifies that Māhiṣmatī (mod. Mādhātā on an island in the Narmadā) is to be regarded as the southern boundary of Madhya-deśa. As Nasik is south of the Narmadā, it must automatically be included in the southern region. Bharukaccha (mod. Baroach) is not, and accordingly has been assigned by Rājaśekhara to the western division. Similarly

the Dakṣiṇāpatha of the astronomical texts includes not only the entire area south of the Narmadā, but even some districts north of it like Bhārukaccha and Girinagara. Accordingly Both Bhārukaccha and Nāsikya are by their classification to be included in the southern division. In view of all the preceding evidence therefore, it is not possible to identify the Naiṣika of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa with Nasik, for the latter will be correctly included later on in the list of western peoples. It accordingly remains to discover some other alternative. Sircar, who is also evidently not satisfied with Naiṣika, suggests Iṣika as a possible reading, but if we accept the Vaijayantī's text, Iṣika, as correct, this alternative is no longer possible. A very hypothetical solution of this problem may be found in regarding Jhillika and Kaulika as corruptions of Śūlika. A people of this name has already been mentioned among the tribes of Uttarāpatha by these purāṇic<sup>33</sup> texts, and the Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa has actually listed Jhillika as a variant. As the Kūrma-vibhāga texts actually refer to a second branch of Śūlikas in the South-east, and several manuscripts of the geographical catalogue of the Mahā-bhārata cite a form Vindhya-cūlika, evidence from independent sources does exist for assuming the existence of a second branch of Śūlikas in this division.

(8) Nalakālīka/ ? Nalakālūpa. The reading once again is uncertain as none of the purāṇic variants contributes anything of value. The parallel passage of the Mahā-bhārata (6.10.53.) includes the variants, Nalakālaka, Nalakānana and Nabhakānana, none of which occurs elsewhere. The Vaijayantī includes in its text of Southern peoples a tribe called the Kulakālakas. This name must be parallel to the Nalakālīkas etc. of the purāṇas. Moreover in the Kūrma-vibhāga section of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa we find a people called the Kakulālakas who are associated with the Niṣādas and the Parṇa-śābaras. Its form at once suggests that it is identical with the Kulakālakas of the Vaijayantī, which, as has already been indicated, corresponds to the Nalakālīka etc. of the Epic and Purāṇic texts.

33. Kirfel, Bhāratavarṇa. p. 45. Br. Mk. Vā. Śūlika, Bd. Jhillika, Vām. Kulūta.

Sircar's suggestion that the reading Nalukālūpa i. e. the Nalas and Alūpas, two dynasties of the Deccan should be adopted, though plausible, is not supported by any direct evidence.

Before we complete our analysis of the list of Dakṣiṇāpatha tribes, one further textual point remains to be discussed. Both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading Kūlya after Cola in the opening line of these texts. While the Colas are well known however, the Kalyas are very obscure and perhaps only owe their place in the text to textual corruption. Law (A. B. O. R. I. 1936 pp. 217ff.) connects them with the Kolas of the Mahā-bhārata, who in turn may be connected with Kollagiri whose location in the south is established by the Mahā-bhārata<sup>34</sup> and the Kūrma-vibhāga texts. Some support for preferring Kola to the unknown Kūlya is supplied by the latter which place Kollagiri and Cola next to one another. The Mārkandeya-purāṇa variant, Golāṅgula, is very interesting; it can scarcely be a corruption, as Pargiter maintained, as the same name occurs in the Bṛhatsaṃhitā (XVI. 3.) along with the Puṇḍras, Śrīparvatas, and Vardhamānas. As this list is an astronomical and not a geographical one however, no conclusion can be derived from it regarding the location of the Golāṅgulas.

Our survey of Dakṣiṇāpatha tribes now being complete, we may summarise our results in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sircar's texts.

Paṇḍyās ca Keralās caiva Colāḥ Kolās tathaiva ca  
Setukā Muṣikās caiva Kumārā Vanavāsikāḥ

.....

Mahārāṣṭrā Māhiṣikāḥ Kaliṅgās caiva sarvaśaḥ  
Ābhīrās ca sahEṣikā Āṭavyāḥ Śabarās tathā  
.....

Pulindā Vindhyaṃaliyā Vidarbhā Daṇḍakāḥ saha  
Paurikā Maulakās caiva Āsmakā Bhogavardhanāḥ  
.....

Śūlikā Kuntalās cĀndhrā Udbhidā Nalakalikāḥ

---

34. MB. 2.28.45, BS. XIV. Markp. 58.23.

It now remains to identify briefly the above and so confirm their location in Dakṣiṇāpatha.

1. Pāṇḍya. Mod. Tinnevely Dist. Capital Mathurā (mod. Madurai). They are the Pandiones of Ptolemy.

2. Kerala. Mod. Malabar and Travancore—Cochin Dists.

3. Cola. Mod. Tanjore and Trichinopoly Dists. Capital Uraiyur (Skt. Uragapura) which corresponds to mod. Old Trichinopoly. They are the Sora of Ptolemy.

4. Kola. If this reading is accepted, the Kolas may be regarded as the inhabitants of Kolla-giri, According to the Mahā-bhārata (2.28.45) it was conquered by Sahadeva along with Mūracīpaṭṭanam (i. e. the Mouziris of the Greeks and mod. Muiyirikkodu). In both the Kūrma-vibhāga texts it is placed next to the Colas, but Rājaśekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṃsā locates it several places away between Kauṅkaṇa and Vallara. Its identification is accordingly somewhat uncertain. Dey identifies it with Kodagu i. e. Coorg on the Malabar coast, while Law locates it at Kolhapur on the basis of epigraphic evidence (E. I. III. 207; XXIII. 30), which refers to a town of Kollapura. Kollagiri and Kollapura however need not necessarily be the same, and if Mūracīpaṭṭanam is mod. Muiyirikkodu, Coorg, judging from the evidence of Sahadeva's digvijaya, is a rather more probable location than Kolhapur.

5. Setuka. The inhabitants of the Setu-bandha, i. e. Adam's Bridge, a chain of islets linking India with Ceylon.

6. Mūṣika. There appears to have been two tribes of this or similar name. One may be located in the extreme south on the Malabar coast between Quilon and Cape Comorin, and a second further north, which is referred to in the Kūrma-vibhāga section of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa as Mṛṣika and placed in the South-east division. Pargiter locates the latter on the river Musi on which stands mod. Hyderabad. The geographical section of the Mahā-bhārata refers to them both. The mention of the Setukas and the Kumāras shows that it

is the Mūṣikas of the far south to whom reference is being made in the present context.

7. Kumāra. The inhabitants of Cape Comorin, the southernmost tip of India.

8. Vanavāsika. The inhabitants of the Kannada speaking areas between the Ghats, the Tuṅgabhadra and the Wardha rivers. The ancient name of this region is preserved by the modern town of Banavasi situated on the left bank of the Wardha.

9. Mahārāṣṭra. The mod. Maratha region. The extent of this well known territory varied from time to time, but its heart may be located in the area between the Upper Godavari and the Kṛṣṇa.

10. Māhiṣaka. The inhabitants of the Narmada valley around Māhiṣmatī (mod. Mādhātā on an island in that river).

11. Kaliṅga. The extent of this large and important kingdom varied from time to time according to different political conditions. In Epic times it is most frequently associated with the Aṅgas and Vāṅgas, and this has led to suggestions that at this period it did not extend south west of Orissa. Abundant epigraphic<sup>35</sup> evidence however shows that the Kaliṅga country extended along the east coast from the Mahānadī to the Godavari rivers.

12. Ābhīra. As mentioned previously, the Ābhīras were originally a North-west people, who by the second century A. D. occupied the areas of mod. Gujarat near the mouth of the Narmada.

13. Iṣika. The region occupied by this people cannot be determined with certainty. In the geographical catalogue of the Mahābhārata they are associated with the Vidarbhas, and in the Rāmāyaṇa with the Vidarbhas and the Māhiṣakas. They may thus be located in the upper section of the Narmada valley.

---

35. For full details of the epigraphic evidence see Chaudhuri, pp. 71-80.

14. *Aṭavya*, According to epigraphic evidence (C.I.I. III. 114; E. I. VIII. 281-7) they are to be closely associated with the *Ḍahālas* or *Cedis* and so may be located in the *Jubbulpur Dist.*

15. *Śabara*. The *Sabarai* of *Ptolemy* and the descendants of the mod. *Saurs* who occupy the *Ganjam Dist.* of *Orissa*. The *Bṛhatsamhitā* divided them into two groups, the *Nagna-śabaras* and the *Paṇṇa-śabaras*. The former must refer to those *Śabaras*, who did not wear any type of clothing, while for the latter, two possibilities have been put forward; firstly the *Paṇṇa-śabaras* may be interpreted as denoting those *Śabaras*, who used leaves as their food as *Pargiter* maintains, or alternatively those members of the tribe who used leaves as clothing. The latter suggestion is much more suited to the context, for then the sense of the whole passage becomes "the *Śabaras* who wear clothes and those who do not." This distinction has doubtless been specifically made in the *Karma-vibhāga* texts to indicate differences in the stages of civilisation and culture among the various branches of *Śabara*. The *Paṇṇa-śabaras* are probably the *Phullitai* of *Ptolemy* (Gk. *phullon* leaf), and may be identified with the modern *Juangs*<sup>86</sup> of *Keonjhar Dist.* of *Orissa*, who even now wear leaves.

16. *Pulinda*. The *Poulindoi Agriophagoi* of *Ptolemy*. Their antiquity is proved by the fact that they are associated in the *Aitareya-brāhmaṇa* (VII. 18. 2.) with the *Śabaras* and the *Āndhras*. According to *Raychaudhuri* (PHAI. p. 258.) their capital, *Pulinda-nagara*, is to be located at *Rupnath* to the East of *Bhilsa*.

17. *Vidarbha*. mod. *Berar*. Capitals *Kuṇḍinapura* (mod. *Kuṇḍinyapura* on the *Wardhā* in the *Chandur taluk* of *Amraoti Dist.*) and *Bhojakaṭa* (mod. *Bhojapura* 6 miles S-E of *Bhilsa*).

18. *Daṇḍaka*. The inhabitants of the forest tracts between *Bundelkhand* and the *Kṛṣṇā*. *Raychaudhuri* (PHAI. 5th ed. p. 91.) would locate their capital at *Kumbhāvati*.

---

86. *Prot.* VII. 1. 66. *B. S. O. A. S.* XIV. p. 85. *Vogel*, *Notes on Ptolemy*. *Elwin*, *Notes on the Juang* (*Man in India*. Vol. 28. p. 1).

19. Paurika. The inhabitants of the city of Purikā, which according to the evidence of the Hari-varṃśa (2.38. 20-22) was situated not far from Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māndhātā) in the Rkṣa mountains.

20. Maulaka. The extremely close association of the Mūlakas with the more powerful Āśmakas causes some difficulty in determining their geographical location. According to Buddhist Sanskrit<sup>37</sup> tradition the Godāvarī formed the original boundary between the two peoples, the Mūlakas occupying the northern bank, and the Āśmakas the south.

21. Āśmaka. At the time of the composition of these purāṇic texts the Āśmakas must have occupied the southern bank of the Godāvarī immediately below Pratiṣṭhāna (mod. Paithan). Such a location is indicated by the separate mention of Mūlaka and Āśmaka. Later on however, they extended northwards across the river and, absorbing their neighbours, the Mūlakas, occupied the modern Nasik and Aurangabad districts.

22. Bhogavardhana. Epigraphic evidence (EI. IX. 299) indicates that Bhogavardhana is to be identified with mod. Bhokardhan, the north-eastern taluk of Aurangabad district.

23. Śūlika. If this reading is accepted, these Śūlikas may be identified with the tribe of the same name mentioned in the Harāha inscription of Īśānavarman (A. D. 554). In this inscription the Śūlikas are mentioned between the Āudhras and the Gaudas, and so are evidently to be located in Orissa, as the names are set in geographical order from south to north. Other records of the Śūlikas have also been found in the same area. Law would identify them with the Solaki of Gujarat or the Cālukyas, but both these suggestions which rest on similarity of form seem somewhat dubious.

---

37. Law. Geography of Early Buddhism p. 21. The text of the Sutta-Nipata (V. 977) implies that the Brahmin priest reached the Mūlaka country proceeding northwards from Assaka (Āśmaka) which lay along the southern bank of the Godāvarī in Dakṣiṇāpatha,



24. Kuntala. Epigraphic evidence indicates that the Kuntalas occupied a considerable area between the Bhīmā and Vedavatī rivers, and so included most of the modern Kannada speaking regions. Capital Kalyānapura (mod. Kalyana 36 miles west of Bidar).

25. Āndhra. The inhabitants of the modern Telugu speaking area on the east coast of India between the Godāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā rivers. Whether the Āndhras originally inhabited this region or migrated there from an earlier abode in the Vindhya is uncertain. Some evidence in favour of the latter contention is supplied by the connection of the Āndhras with the Āsmakas in Buddhist<sup>38</sup> texts and their association with the Pulindas at the time of the composition of the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa. Also in the present day in the Amraoti district lives a tribe of Andhs, who may well be the descendants of the ancient Āndhras. Their importance at the time of Alexander is attested by Pliny who, following Megasthenes, states that they possessed thirty fortified towns and a vast army. (N H. 6. 22).

26. Udbhida. This name so far remains unidentified.

27. Nalakālika. The location of this tribe is quite uncertain. Dey would connect them with the Nelcynda of Ptolemy (mod Kottayam in Travancore). Shafer (EAI. p 75), on account of their proximity with the Andhras, locates them along the Kistnā river and Nallamalai mountains. Both identifications are only conjectures, though the latter is certainly much more in conformity with the available data than the former.

#### APARĀNTA-DEŚA

Kirfel's text.

Śūrpārakāḥ Kalivanā Durgāḥ Kālitakāḥ saha  
Puleyās ca Siṇālās ca Rūpasās Tāpasāḥ saha  
tathā Taittirikās caiva sarve caiva Kār<sup>39</sup>askarāḥ  
Nāsikyās caiva ye cānye ye caiv Āntaranarmadāḥ

<sup>38</sup>. Malalasekhara. Dict. of Pali Proper Names. I. p. 109.

<sup>39</sup>. Scansion here requires an obligatory short syllable,

Bhārukacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sārasvatāir api  
Kacchīyās ca Surāṣṭrās ca Ānartās cĀrbudaiḥ saha

**Sircar's text.**

Śūrpānakāḥ Kolavanā Durgās Tālikaṭaiḥ saha  
Puleyās ca Surā (Murā ?) lās ca Rūpasās Tāmasaiḥ saha  
tathā tu Raminās caiva sarve caiva Kāraskarāḥ  
Nāsikyādyās ca ye cānye ye caivOttaranarmadāḥ  
Bhāru (Bhṛgu)-kacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sārasvatāir api  
Kacchīyās ca Surāṣṭrās ca Ānartās cĀrbudaiḥ saha

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations. (1) K. Kalivana. S. Kolavana; (2) K. Kāntaka. S. Tālikaṭa; (3) K. Sirāla. S. Surāla. ? Murāla; (4) K. Tāpasa. S. Tāmasa; (5) K. Tattirika. S. tu Raminas; (6) K. Antaranarmada. S. Uttaranarmada; (7) K. Bhārukaccha. S. Bhāru (Bhṛgu) kaccha. Of these no. 7. is merely a question of whether one should adopt the Prakrit or Sanskrit form for Baraoch and accordingly does not require further discussion.

(1) Kalivana / Kolavana. Epigraphic evidence supplies the clue to the correct reading in this case. In two grants of Prthivīcandra Bhogaśakti, a member of the Harīścandra dynasty, who ruled in the seventh and early eighth centuries A.D. an area roughly comprising modern Nasik district as the feudatory vassal of the Western Calukyas (EI. XXV. 230), we find a reference to the town of Kallivana, which corresponds exactly to Kirfel's reading, Kalivana. This may easily be identified with mod. Kalvan in the north-west region of Nasik district.

(2) Kālitaka / Tālikaṭa. The accuracy of Sircar's form, Tālikaṭa, is proved by the Kūrma-vibhāga texts which locate it in the South. The apparent difference of direction however need cause no difficulty for, as previously mentioned, the boundaries adopted by the compilers of the various texts are useful for that one system of classification only, so that, what one source might include in the West, another would place in the South. Kirfel's form, Kālitaka, can easily be explained.

as a confusion of the original name due to carelessness in transcription. Tālikāṭa is also mentioned as a variant reading in the digvijaya of Sahadeva, where the Poona Critical<sup>40</sup> Edition reads Copakṛta which however must be almost certainly wrong. In this passage also Tālikāṭa is mentioned close to Śūrpāraka and so the accuracy of the puranic lists is confirmed by an independent source.

(3) Sirāla / Surāla ? Murāla. The text here is very doubtful, as none of the variants listed by the different Purāṇas can be traced in other sources. This has led Sircar to conjecture that the form, Surāla, is an error for Murāla. Such an hypothesis at first sight has much to recommend it; Devanāgarī s and m by reason of their close similarity are constantly confused in orthography, while the existence of a tribe called the Murālas who lived on the banks of a river of the same name, is proved by at least two independent sources, Rājaśekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṃsā and Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa. The former locates it in Dakṣiṇāpatha and places it between Kāvera and Vanavāsaka and accordingly implies that it is to be located in the far south, a position that is confirmed by the Raghuvamśa (IV. 55), which implies that the Murāla river was situated in or near Kerala. Sircar, following Dey, identifies the Murala with the Mūlamuthā which rises near Poona and is a tributary of the Bhīmā, but this appears to be too far north to be correct in view of the location implied by the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā and Raghuvamśa. For the same reason therefore it is doubtful whether Surāla should be regarded as corrupt for Murāla. Shafer (EAI. p. 78) identifies the Sirālas with Sirel near Miraj in the Kolhapur district of Bombay. Such an identification can only depend on the similarity between the ancient and modern names, but the location would suit the requirements of the purāṇic texts.

(4) Tāpasa/Tāmasa. Kirfel's reading is the more probable. The Kūrmavibhāga mention in their lists of southern peoples

---

40. MB. 2 28 43; MSS. V<sub>1</sub> B<sub>2</sub> Dn<sub>1</sub> Tālākata; B<sub>2</sub> B<sub>2</sub> Dns D<sub>2</sub> Tālīkaṭa.

a name, Tāpasāsrama, with which Tāpasa may at once be connected. As we have seen before, the apparent difference in direction is no obstacle in associating the two names with each other. According to Dey, Tāpasāsrama may be identified as with mod. Panderpur or Pandharpur on the southern bank of the Bhīmā in Sholapur district. Sircar's reading, Tāmasa, appears very doubtful. It cannot refer to the Tāmasavana which must be located in the Panjab, not to the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tāmasā, i.e. mod. Tones, a branch of the Sarayū in Oudh, as neither of these places can possibly be located in the western division. Dey also lists two other Tāmasā rivers, one in Rewa and the other in Garhwal, but both of these would also be quite out of place.

(5) Taittirika/tu Ramina. The text at this point is very difficult to determine. In addition to the forms adopted by Kirfel and Sircar, the Mārkaṇḍeya purāṇa reads Kurumina (which Chaudhuri follows) and the Vāyupurāṇa, Turasita. The most probable reading at a superficial glance would be Turasita, which at once suggests some connection with the Tārakṣiti of the Karma-vibhāga texts, where it is located in the tail of the "tortoise", i.e. in the West. Unfortunately this is a far too easy solution, for a detailed analysis of the Karma-vibhāga texts at once shows that the 'West' of these texts does not correspond with our modern ideas of what would constitute western India, nor with those of the compiler of the Bhuvana-kośa texts, who clearly identifies it with the coastal portion of Bombay State on both sides of the Nerbada. As the Tārakṣiti are associated with peoples like the Rāmaṭhas, Pāradas, Jṛiṅgas, Vaiśyas etc. it is obvious that they have no place in the western region of the Bhuvana-kośa texts. For the same reason it is impossible to accept Chaudhuri's reading of Kurumina, which he tentatively identifies with Karmania or Kerman in Persia. In stressing that the Pāradas etc. have been included in the West, he shows that he has fundamentally failed to appreciate the completely different systems of classification employed by the compilers of the Bhuvana-kośa lists and the Kūrma-vibhāga texts.

Kirfel's reading, Taittirika, however seems rather more likely. A people called the Tittiras is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (6.46.50.) along with the Colas, Pāṇḍyas and Śabaras. Their association with these tribes would suggest that they are to be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. In the Mahābhārata however, this term is often used loosely of the entire area south of the Narmada, and so would necessarily include that part of purāṇic Aparānta-dēsa which lay south of that river. This can be proved by using the next name in the text, Kāṭaskara, as an example. The purāṇic lists locate it with the Māhiṣakas, Kālīṅgas and Keralas, all of whom are placed by these same lists in the south. Accordingly, the association of the Taittiras with the Colas etc. is no serious obstacle to adopting Kirfel's text, which is based on the Matsya-purāṇa. The difficulty arises from the fact that the portion of Aparānta-dēsa, which is south of the Narmadā in the purāṇic texts, is included by the Mahābhārata in Dakṣiṇāpatha; in other words the two areas overlap one another to some degree.

(5) Antaranarmada/Uttaranarmada. The difficulty here rests entirely with the meaning. Antaranarmada has been interpreted as referring to those tribes, who live within the basin of the Narmadā, while Uttaranarmada has been taken to denote those peoples who live on the northern bank of that river. Such is the translation suggested by Pargiter (Markp. (trans.) p. 339). It also however seems possible to interpret the compound Uttaranarmada as Bahuvrīhi "those having the Narmadā to their north" i. e. those tribes living to the south of the Narmadā, whose northern boundary is determined by that river. It is significant that all the names previously listed, where identification is possible, are to the south of the Narmadā :

Śūrpāraka (Sopara), Tālikāṭa (associated with Śūrpāraka and therefore south of the Narmadā), Kalivāna (Kalvan), Tāpasa (Pandharpur), Taittirika and Kāraskara (in South according to Mahābhārata and therefore below Narmadā), Nāsikya (Nasik). Accordingly, if Uttaranarmada is interpreted in this sense, it is a distinctly preferable reading to Antaranarmada, which would

refer to the tribes living near the sources of the Narmadā, an area which would properly belong to the Vindhya division. Moreover further support is given to the reading, Uttaranaimada, by the fact that all the names in the next śloka are to be located north of the Narmadā. The Aparānta-deśa is accordingly extremely well defined; it consists of an area on both sides of the Narmadā, which perhaps bisects it. In the first part of the text, only tribes to its south are enumerated, and in the second section, which starts with Bhārukaccha, only tribes to its north.

Before we complete our analysis of the list of western tribes, one further textual point is perhaps worthy of consideration. Both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading Puleya, while the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa reads Pulinda and the Matsya-purāṇa Kuliya. The Pulindas are of course very well known and are usually associated with the śābaras and located in the south. As it is not possible to confirm from any independent text that they should be included within the boundaries of Aparānta-deśa, the Mārkaṇḍeya text is accordingly very doubtful and probably is the result of a copyist's "effort" to "correct the passage" by substituting a well known name for what was to him at least an unknown one. The Matsya form, Kuliya, at once suggests that it may be connected with the Kūlyas, who have been mentioned already among the tribes of Madhya-deśa and Dakṣiṇāpatha. As nothing however is known about these Kūlyas from independent sources, their name may not be authentic but one which owes its existence to textual corruption. The one advantage in reading Puleya is that it is free from the difficulties present in Pulinda and Kalya, namely that they have already been located in these texts in divisions other than Aparānta-deśa. Even so Puleya is a very doubtful form, for there is no evidence for its existence in any independent source which would confirm the accuracy of its form. The depth of corruption at this point of the text and the resulting confusion is clearly indicated by the corresponding section of the Mahā-bhārata (6.10.62), where a vast number of variants are found, none of which contributes anything to the solution of the problem. The Critical Edition adopts the form 'Ādidāya', but the whole crux goes so deep that

this reading can reflect nothing more than the subjective choice of the editor.

The following comments are made purely by way of suggestion only. Devanagari l and t are very similar in orthography. By changing l to t in Puleya we obtain a form Puteya, which is perhaps a metathesis of Tāpeya, i. e. the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tāpī (mod. Tapti). The context makes it clear that a location south of the Narmadā is essential to any reading.

A second serious difficulty in both Kirfel's and Sircar's texts, is the reading, Rūpasa. As Chaudhuri rightly says (p. 149 n17), "For the Rupasas there is hardly any reliable notice." It is therefore probable that the Rūpasas owe their existence to textual corruption. The corresponding text of the Mahābhārata (6. 10. 62.), where the editor of the Poona Critical Edition reads Stubaka, has a host of variants, of which the most interesting, Sūnapas, may well provide the key to the solution of this problem. It is clear that Sūpana and Rūpasa are jumbled forms of what must have originally been the same name, as both have every letter in common except r and n. The confusion here is doubtless due to the orthographical similarity between Devanagari r and n. Most significantly however the Mahābhārata form, Sūpana, can be re-arranged by metathesis as Anūpas, which is the name of a very well known tribe in Sanskrit Literature. If we substitute Anūpas for Rūpasa in the purāṇic texts, it is accordingly necessary to locate them south of the Narmadā in Aparānta-deśa. The most definite passage for the Anūpas is to be found in the Raghuvamśa (VI. 37-43.), which states that Māhiṣmatī, on the Revā, was the capital of Anūpas. In the Nasik record of queen Gautamī Bālāsri they are placed between Aparānta and Vidarbha. The general conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that the Anūpas are to be located south of the Narmadā in Dakṣiṇāpatha rather than in Aparānta-deśa. This however would overlook the basic meaning of Anūpa

which is explained in the Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi as a tract of land near water, an example being Kaccha. In the Mahābhārata, Anūpa is mentioned as a coastal portion of the sea (sāgarānū-pavāsinaḥ). Accordingly, if we locate the Anūpas on the southern bank of the Narmadā between Māndhātā and the sea, they may easily be included in Aparānta-deśa. Possibly at the time of the epics and purāṇas they occupied the coastal area to the south of the mouth of the Narmadā and later extended inland eastwards to Māhiṣmatī.

Our survey of the tribes of Aparānta-deśa now being complete, we may summarise our results in the form of a new text. As before, all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sūcar's texts.

South of Narmadā :

Śūrpārakāḥ Kalivanā Durgās Tālikatāiḥ saha  
 .....  
Tāpeyās ca Sirālās ca Anūpās Tāpasaiḥ saha  
 .....  
 tathā Taittirikās caiva saive caiva Karaskarāḥ  
 .....  
Nāsikyādyās ca ye cānye ye caivOttarānarmadāḥ  
 .....

North of Narmadā :

Bhārukacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sārasvatāir api  
 Kacchīyās ca Suiāṣṭrās ca Ānartās cĀrbudaiḥ saha

It now remains to identify the above briefly and so confirm their location in Aparānta-deśa.

1. Śūrpāraka. The Sopara of the Greeks. Mod. Sopara in Thana district, 37 miles north of Bombay, and 4 miles north-west of Bassim.

2. Kalivana. Mod. Kalvan in the north-west of Nasik district.



3. Durgā. Their identity is uncertain. Dey lists a river Durgā as a tributary of the Sabarmatī in Gujarat, which would correspond roughly to the area required, but which is unfortunately to the north of the Narmadā, whereas all the names in this śloka must be located to its south. However it is nevertheless probable that the Durgas of this passage may be identified with the inhabitants of the banks of the Durgā river, for Dey's identification is probably wrong. According to the pauṇḍric texts, the Durgā issued from the Ṛkṣa range, which may be identified with the modern Satpuras. Accordingly, the Durgā is to be placed to the south of the Narmadā.

4. Tālikaṭa. The generally accepted identification of this name with Talakāḍi or Talkaḍ, the capital or the Gaṅgas on the Kāverī 30 miles east of Mysore is very improbable, for Talkaḍ is so far south that it can only be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. The evidence of the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas makes it clear that the Tālikaṭas must be located somewhere near Bombay.

(5) Tāpeya. If this suggestion is accepted, the Tāpeyas are obviously to be identified with the inhabitants along the banks of the river Tapti.

(6) Sirāla. Perhaps Shirol near Miraj (Kolhapur district)

(7) Anūpa. If this reading is accepted, the Ānūpas are to be located on the coast immediately to the south of the mouth of the Narmadā. Later they extended their influence inland as far as Māndhātā.

(8) Tāpasa. Mod. Pandharpur on the Bhīmā.

(9) Taitirika. South of the Narmadā, but it is not possible to suggest a more precise location.

(10) Karaskara. Dey would locate them at Karakal in South Kanara district.

(11) Nāsikya. Mod. Nasik.

(12) Uttaranarmada. The tribes living on the south bank of the Narmadā whose northern boundary is formed by that river.

(13) Bharukaccha. Mod. Batoach, 30 miles from the sea on the north side of the Narmadā. A town of great commercial importance, it was known to the Greeks as Baiygaza.

(14) Māheya. The inhabitants of the bank of the river Mahī, which flows through Malwa into the Gulf of Cambay north of the Narmadā.

(15) Sārasvata. The inhabitants of the bank of the river Sarasvatī, which, rising in Mt. Abu, flows into the sea near Prabhāsa (mod. Somanath). Sircar erroneously connects it with the river Sarsuti, which must be located in the north.

(16) Kacchīya. The water-logged portions of the sea-coast from the Gulf of Cambay to Batoach.

(17) Surāṣṭra. The Syracene of the Periplus and Ptolemy. The Surāṣṭras occupied the lower half of the peninsula of Kathiawar around Junagadh. Their name survives in modern Surat.

(18) Ānarta. The Halar division of Kathiawar. Capitals Kuśasthālī (mod. Dvārakā) and Ānartapura, later called Ānandapura (mod. Vadnagar).

(19) Arbuda. The inhabitants of Mt. Abu in the Aravalli range in the Sirohi State of Rajputana, a hill of great religious sanctity to the Jains.

#### VINDHYAN REGION

##### Kirfel's text

Mālavās ca Karūṣās ca Mekalās cOtkalaiḥ saha  
Uttamārṇā Daśārṇās ca Bhojāḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha  
Tośalāḥ Kośalās caiva Traipurā Vaidiśās tathā  
Tumurās Tumbarās caiva Śaṭpurā Naiṣadhaiḥ saha  
Anūpās Tuṇḍikerās ca Vitihotrā hy Avantayāḥ

##### Sircar's text

Maladās ca Karūṣās ca Mekalās cOtkalaiḥ saha  
Uttamārṇā Daśārṇās ca Bhojāḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha  
Tośalāḥ Kośalās caiva Traipurā Vaidiśās tathā

Tumurās Tumburās caiva ( ? Tumbānās Tumbavanaś  
ca) Paṭavo Niṣadhaiḥ saha  
Anūpās Tuṇḍikerās ca Vītibotrā Avantayaḥ

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations.

(1) K. Mālava. S. Malada ; (2) K. Tumura Tumbara. S. ? Tumbāna Tumbavana. (3) K. Ṣaṭpura. S. Paṭu.

(1) Mālava/Malada. The Mālavas are a very well known<sup>41</sup> tribe in ancient Indian history. Originally they lived in the north-west and are identified by most scholars with the Malloi of the Greeks, who made such a tenacious resistance to Alexander. The Mālavas in the present text are generally located in modern Malwa, a view however which ignores several important considerations. Firstly there is a serious chronological difficulty, as the Mālavas did not occupy the area of western Malwa until at least the sixth century A.D. Until that date Avanti was known by its own name; only from the sixth century A.D. did it become known as Mālava, the earliest reference to the arrival of the Mālavas in the vicinity of Ujjayinī, the Avanti capital, being made in Bāṇa's Kādambarī (ed. Ridding p. 221). As the Bhuvana-kośa lists must have been composed before that date, the Mālavas could not have been anywhere near Malwa. Numismatic evidence indicates that from the second to the fourth century A.D., they lived in the area of Jaipur, where large numbers of their coins have been found. Later they appear to have migrated further south to the areas of Mewar and Kotah.

Apart from chronological factors, there are sound textual reasons for doubting the authenticity of Mālava as the original reading. If we accept Mālava as an integral part of the text, there would be no reason for the inclusion of Avanti, as according to the lexicographers the two names are synonymous. Even more decisive is the evidence of the Vaijayantī, which includes the Maladas at the head of its Vindhya section—'atheme Maladādyākhyā Vindhyaparyantavāsinaḥ.' The same

41. For the latest detailed study see IHQ. 24, p. 171 ff.

work continues by identifying the Maladas with the Sthauras and the Karūṣas with the Bṛhadgr̥has. For these considerations also Malava is an unlikely reading.

Finally a comparison of the environment in which the Maladas or Mālavas are to be located brings one to the same conclusion. The other tribes mentioned in the same line are the Karūṣas, Mekulas and Utkalas. Of these the Mekulas may be identified with the inhabitants of the modern Maikal range, and the Utkalas with those of the interior of Orissa. Even more important however is the location of the Karūṣas. A tradition recorded in the Rāmāyaṇa (I. 14) groups the Karūṣas and the Maladas together, and traces the origin of the two names to a common mythology. The Karūṣas may be located on epigraphic evidence (A. S. R. III. 67-71) in the Shahabad district of Bihar. In such an environment Malada would be a vastly superior reading to Mālava.

(2) K. Tumura Tumbara / S. ? Tumbāna Tumbavana. This pair of names, which have been taken together for the sake of convenience, involves considerable difficulty both as regards their actual form and their location. Sircar's suggestion of Tumbavana is supported by the Bṛhatsaṃhitā, which locates them in the south and also by the evidence of the Tumain Inscription of Kumāragupta. (E. I. XXVI. pt. 3). A name, Tumbupa, occurs in the Mahābhārata (6.46.51) among the list of tribes on the wings of Yudhiṣṭhira's army, but, as there are numerous variants, it is far from certain that Tumbupa is the correct reading at that point. The Tumbaras are however mentioned in the Harivaṃśa (5. 310-1), where together with the Niṣādas they are described as the descendants of a king Niṣāda, while Buddhabhaṭṭa's<sup>42</sup> Ratna-parīkṣā and other texts describe their territory as a source of rubies. Accordingly we may accept Sircar's suggestion for this part of the text with the slight emendation of Tumbara for Tumbāna as both

---

42. Ratna-parīkṣā III. 124 (Text in Finot's *Les Lapidaires Indiens* p. 28), also Agastimata III. 177 (ibid. p. 106), Nava-ratna-parīkṣā IV. 108 (ibid. p. 159), Ratna-saṅgraha 8 (ibid. p. 196).

Tumbara and Tumbavana are established by independent literary and epigraphic sources.

(3) K. Ṣatpura / Paṭu. The diversity of readings both on the part of the original texts and of the critical editors indicates that the degree of corruption is considerable at this point. In his earlier edition of these texts published in his *Bhāratavaṣa* (p. 62), Kirfel originally adopted the *Vāmana-purāṇa* form, *Vāhela*, which Dey identified with Baghelkhand. The *Vāyu-purāṇa* reads *Satsura* and the *Matsya-purāṇa* *Paḍgama* or *Satgama*, but none of these forms can be traced elsewhere. If *Ṣatpura* is accepted as the reading here, it is evidently to be identified with the modern *Satpura* range. Such an assumption however seems extremely improbable for there is no evidence that *Ṣatpura* was in current usage at the time of the composition of the *Purāṇas*. Sircar's variant, *Paṭu*, seems the best reading in the present state of knowledge. While it cannot be traced elsewhere, at the same time it does not involve one in the difficulties that surround the adoption of *Ṣatpura*. For the present however there is insufficient evidence to attempt any solution of the problem.

Our survey of the textual problems now being completed, our results may accordingly be tabulated in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sircar's texts.

Maladās ca Karūṣās ca Mekalās cOtkalaiḥ saha  
.....

Uttamārṇa Daśārnās ca Bhojāḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha  
Toṣalāḥ Kośalās civa Traipurā Vaidiśās tatha  
Tumbārās Tumbavanās caiva Paṭavo Naiṣadhaiḥ saha  
.....

Anupās Tuṇḍikerās ca Vitihotrā Avantayaḥ

It now remains to identify the above briefly and so confirm their location in *Vindhya-deśa*.

(1) Malada. Mod. Baghelkhand region.

(2) Karaṇṣa. Mod. Shahabad district.

(3) Mekala. The inhabitants of the Maikal range

(4) Utkala. Originally the Utkalas occupied the interior districts of Orissa near the Maikal hills. Later they extended eastwards towards the sea down the Mahānadī valley. Their capital may be placed at Chaudnai opposite Katak.

(5) Uttamārṇa. If we follow Wilson's interpretation of Daśārṇa as "ten forts", and translate Uttamārṇa as the "highest forts", it would be reasonable to locate them on the highest parts of the Vindhya, i. e. on the Mahadeo Hills.

(6) Daśārṇa. This people may be located on the banks of the river Daśārṇā (mod. Dhasan, which, rising near Saugor, flows through Bundelkhand into the Betwa). According to Jain sources its capital was Mṛttikavatī, which the Hari-vaṁśa (1.36.15) places on the Narmadā.

(7) Bhoja. According to purāṇic tradition, the Bhojas were a branch of Yādavas, who founded the kingdom of Vidarbha. Similarly in the Raghu-vaṁśa (V. 39.) the king of Vidarbha was a Bhoja. The mention of Bhojakaṭa in the Chammak Copperplate Inscription of Pravarasena III (C.I.I. III. p. 236) proves that the territory occupied by the Bhojas in Berar included the areas of mod. Elīchpur and Chammak.

(8) Kiṣkindhaka. Dey would connect this name with the famous Kiṣkindhya Mt. of the Rāmāyaṇa, and locate it near a small hamlet, which still retains the same name, in Dharwar district on the south bank of the Tuṅgabhadrā near Anagondi, three miles from Vijaynagar and close to Bellary. The purāṇic texts however imply a more northern location and this is supported by the Kūrma-vibhāga lists, which include the Kiṣkindhakas in the South-east (i. e. Vindhya) region.

(9). Tośala. Its extremely close association with the Dakṣiṇa Kośalas is attested by at least three other texts, Rāja-śekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, Bharata's Nāṭya-śāstra and the Pari-

śiṣṭa to the Atharva-veda. It is also mentioned in Asoka's Rock Edict found at Dhaulti, while other inscriptions refer to a Uttara Tośala and a Dakṣiṇa Tośala (EI. IX. 286 ; XV. 3.). The Gaṇḍa-vyūha, a Sanskrit Buddhist text, refers to a town of Tosala in Amita-Tosala. According to the epigraphic evidence, the Tośala-viśaya covered a large area from the Suvarṇarekhā down to the Rṣikulyā. At the time of the composition of the purāṇic lists however it probably occupied a smaller area centred on the Dhaulti and Balasor districts.

(10) Kosala. Epigraphic<sup>43</sup> evidence proves that the Dakṣiṇa-Kosalas occupied a large area of the Chattisgarh region, extending eastwards to Sambalpur district and the South Mahā-nadī Valley.

(11) Traipura. The inhabitants of the town of Tripurī (mod. Teor on the Narbadā, seven miles west of Jabulpur. The Vaijyantī makes them synonymous with the Hāhālas (i.e. a corruption of Dahāla) and the Cedis.

(12) Vaidiśa. The inhabitants of Vidiśā (mod. Bhilsa, 27 miles N-E of Bhopal).

(13) Tumbāra. Sircar tentatively identifies it with Turrān, 45 miles north of Ratanpur.

(14) Tumbavana. Mod. Tumain, 50 miles N-W of Eran in Gwalior State.

(15) Paṭu. Not identifiable.

(16) Naiṣadha. This people are generally located on the Satpura Hills, N-W of Berar.

(17) Anūpa. The Raghu-vaṁśa definitely establishes their location around Māhīśmatī (mod. Māndhātā in Nimār District).

(18) Tuṇḍikera. Perhaps mod. Tendukhara near the Narmadā in Narsinghpur District.

(19) Vītihotra. A branch of the Haihayas. Their location within the Vindhya division is uncertain.

(20) Avanti. Mod. Malwa. Capital Ujjayinī (mod. Ujjain).

---

43. For detailed analysis of epigraphic evidence see Chaudhuri. p. 74ff.

# HIMALAYAN DIVISION

## Kirfel's text.

Nihāra Hamśamārgāś ca Kupathās Taṅgaṇāḥ Khaṣāḥ  
Kuthapṛāvaraṇāś caiva Ūṇā Dāivāḥ sa-Hūhukāḥ  
Trigartā Maṇḍalāś caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha

## Sircar's text.

Nirāhārā Hamśamārgāḥ Kuravas Taṅgaṇāḥ Khaṣāḥ  
Karnapṛāvaraṇāś caiva Haṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Hūhukāḥ  
Trigartā Mālavāś caiva Kirātās Tāmasaiḥ  
(Tomaraiḥ ?) saha

An analysis of the above texts show the following variations.

(1) K. Nihāra. S. Nirāhāra; (2) K. Kupatha. S. Kuru;  
(3) K. Kuthapṛāvaraṇa. S. Karnapṛāvaraṇa; (4) K. Ūṇa. S.  
Haṇa; (5) K. Maṇḍala. S. Mālava; (6) K. Tāmara. S. Tāmasa.  
(Tomara).

(1) Nihāra / Nirāhāra. The Vāyu-purāṇa variant, Nigar-  
hāra, is interesting as it may be regarded as a colloquial form  
of Nagarahāra, which is mentioned in an inscription as a town  
of Uttarāpatha. The Parāśara<sup>44</sup> likewise locates it in the same  
division, while Hiuan Tsang refers to it as Na-kie-lo-ho.  
Alberuni locates the Nirāhāras as living behind Mārigāla i.e.  
Takṣaśilā (mod. Taxila). The consensus of this evidence would  
place the Nirāhāra in the vicinity of Jalalabad.

(2) Kupatha/Kuru. If the latter name is adopted as the  
reading, it must refer to the Uttara-kurus, a semi-mythical  
people living to the north of the Himalayas. Kupatha on the  
other hand may be connected with the Kārāpatha of the Raghu-  
varṃśa and the Kārūpatha of the Rāmāyaṇa. It has been  
identified with Kārābagh or Baghan on the west bank of the  
Indus at the foot of the Salt Range in Bannu District. Though  
both Kuru and Kupatha may be located without difficulty in  
the Himalayas, the latter seems preferable, as they may be placed

---

<sup>44</sup> J. A. S. B. XVII p. 492; Parāśara (Text in Brahatsaṃhitā, Vizian-  
agram S. S. p. 293).



in the area suggested by their neighbours, Nirāhāra (Jalalabad), Hāmsamārga ( ? Hunza and Nagar districts), and Taṅgaṇa (the region extending from the Rāngaṅgā to the Upper Sarayū) much more easily than the Uttara-kurus, who must be located in Tibet.

(3) Kuthapṛāvaraṇa/Karṇapṛāvaraṇa. The Karṇapṛāvaraṇas are mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa in the eastern division along with the Kirātas. Accordingly they may be located in the eastern Himalayas. Another tribe of the same name are placed by two passages of the Mahābhārata in the Vindhyas. The Karṇapṛāveyas of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts, which are located in the S-W (i.e. N-W.) along with the Śūdras and Pāraśavas, are probably identical with the Karṇa-pṛāvaraṇas and the Rāmāyaṇa.

(4) Ūrṇa/Hūna. These names have been discussed in the Uttarāpatha section, paragraph. 22.

(5) Maṇḍala/Mālava. Sircar's text is almost certainly correct. At the time of the composition of the epic and purāṇic lists the Mālavas lived in the N-W and did not migrate to the Vindhyas until some time later. Their close association with the Trigartas is attested by several passages of the Mahābhārata. Kirfel's variant, Maṇḍala, cannot be traced elsewhere.

(6) Tāmara/? Tāmasa.? Tomara The people mentioned here must be identical with those mentioned immediately before the Kirātas in the Uttarāpatha section, where Kirfel and Sircar both agree on the name, Tomara. At the same time it must be stressed that there is nothing to prevent the choice of Tāmasa (the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tons) here, for such a location can easily be included within the Uttarāpatha and Himalayan divisions.

Though both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading, Hūhuka, as one of the names of this division, it is important to compare this name which occurs before Hūṇa and Dārva with that occurring before the same two names in the Uttarāpatha division where Kirfel reads Cāhuka and Sircar suggests its emendation

to Bāhika. For a discussion of this problem and the conclusions reached, see the Uttarāpatha section paragraph 21.

In accordance with our usual procedure, the result of our analysis can be tabulated in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names will denote new readings different from those of Kirfel and Sircar, while a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between the two.

Nirāhārā Haṁsamārgāḥ Kupathās Taṅgaṇāḥ Khasāḥ  
.....

Karṇaprāvaraṇās caiva Huṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Kūhukāḥ  
.....

Trigartā Mālavās caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha  
.....

It now remains to identify the above mentioned names briefly and so confirm their location in the Himalayan region. Unfortunately it is not possible to locate most of them with any precise degree of accuracy, as in mountainous areas such as this, many tribes would tend to be nomadic in their habits.

(1) Nirāhāra. The inhabitants of mod. Nanghenhar or Nangnihar, 4 miles west of Jalalabad.

(2) Haṁsamārga. Possibly mod. Hunza and Nagar districts.

(3) Kupatha. If, as is probable, this is regarded as identical with the Kārāpatha of the Raghuvamśa, it may be identified with Karabagh at the foot of the Salt Range in Bannu district. Upadhyaya<sup>45</sup> however has located it at Chandpur east of Saharanpur in the land of the Northern Mallas.

(4) Taṅgaṇa. The Ganganoi of Ptolemy, being an orthographical error for t. They may be located in the central Himalayas in the area stretching from the river Rāmagaṅgā to the Upper Sarayū.

(5) Khasa. Mod. Khakkhas to the west of Nepal.

---

<sup>45</sup>. India in Kalidasa. p. 68.

(6) Karpaprāvaṇa. As mentioned previously the evidence of the Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa would place them in the Eastern Himalayas.

(7-9) Hūṇa Dārva Kūhuka. For their location see the Uttarāpatha section.

(10) Trigarta. Mod. Jalandhar region.

(11) Mālava. They are generally identified with the Malloi of the Greeks and located in the area of Multan, which is rather too far south to be included in the Himalayas. This identification of Skt. Mālava and Gk. Malloi is by no means certain. In the first place it is reasonable to assume that the Greeks would transcribe Sanskrit place-names as accurately as the phonemes of their native language would permit. Accordingly Malloi is a more accurate transcription of Skt. Malla than of Mālava. Moreover the Mallas are well-known in Sanskrit Literature as the name of a tribe, being mentioned in the Epics, Purāṇas, the Parāśara-tantra, the Brhat-saṁhitā and the geographical section of the Mahā-māyūrī etc. The objection to the identification of Greek Malloi with Skt. Malla however does not depend on any linguistic argument, but on grounds of geographical location. The Mallas mentioned in the Epics and Purāṇas are located by these texts in the East; the Malloi of the Greeks must necessarily be in the N-W. In view of this discrepancy of direction Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malla cannot be associated together; therefore one must search for a name that overcomes this obstacle. This is to be found in Sanskrit Mālava, which is conveniently listed in the North by passages in the Epics and Purāṇas. On the basis of these arguments Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Mālavas are considered to refer to one and the same people. This conclusion however fails to take into account one important piece of evidence, that of the Parāśara-tantra, which locates the Mallas in the north-West along with the Tuṣāras and Tālas. This evidence overcomes the objection to equating Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malla, as one may now assume the existence of two branches of Mallas, one in the East and the other in the

North-West. Moreover the Parāśara-tantra specifically mentions the Mālavas as distinct from the Mallas, and locates them in the North. Accordingly, this information makes the problem of the location of the Mālavas easier to solve. One is no longer troubled by the difficulty of having to assume that they migrated from the area between the Jhelum and the Chenab (where Greek sources place the Malloi) at some date soon after Alexander's invasion to Nagarchal in mod. Jaipur district where large hordes of their coins have been found. The former area was occupied by the Mallas and the latter by the Mālavas who may have migrated there from the Himalayas, if their inclusion in the list of "mountainous" countries is correct.

(12) Kirāta and (13) Tāmara. For location see Uttarāpatha section, nos 37 and 38.

In conclusion a peculiar feature of the Himalayan list requires a brief comment. It will be noticed that of the 13 tribes enumerated, no fewer than 7 have already been located in Uttarāpatha, viz. Hamsamārga, Tāṅgaṇa, Hūṇa Dāva, Hahuka (? Kūhuka), Kirāta, and Tāmara. Furthermore all these names have been taken from the last two ślokas of the Uttarāpatha section only. The reason that at once suggests itself as an explanation of this repetition is that the Himalayan portion may be a later addition to the whole text, perhaps with the purpose of giving a more detailed description of that particular area to the reader, the Vaijayantī appears to supply some evidence in support of this view. While as regards the other six divisions it follows the Purāṇas exactly, it yet omits the Himalayan region which, if its mention of the Trigartas is any criterion, it must have included in Uttarāpatha. It is quite clear therefore that the Uttarāpatha and Himalayan regions must overlap one another to some extent in the Purāṇas; had they each represented a distinctly separate area, no such repetitions would have been possible. In this respect it is worth comparing them with the Vindhya section, where every single name (with the possible exception of Anūpa) is a new one. In view of these considerations therefore we may conclude that the Himalayan portion was not originally part of

this geographical list, but may later have been added as an amplification of the last part of the Uttarāpatha section. Compare :

Uttarāpatha--

Aupagās cĀlimadiās ca Kirātānām ca jāṭayah  
Tāmarā Hamsamārgās ca Kāśmīrās Taṅganāḥ  
Kulutāḥ Kuhukās caiva Hūṇā Darvās tathaiva ca

Himālayas—

Nigarhārā Hamsamārgāḥ Kupathās Taṅganāḥ Khasāḥ  
Karṇapīāvaraṇās caiva Hūṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Kūhukāḥ  
Trigartā Mālavās caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha

With the investigation of the Himalayan list completed, all the geographical names of the Bhuvanakośa texts have been examined. Of the large number of names included in this list about three-quarters of them have been now identified with some degree of accuracy. No one is more aware than the author that a number of suggested readings and identifications are extremely tentative, but if they only serve to arouse interest and even controversy in this important subject, he feels they will have achieved their purpose.

## पुराणेष्वपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त

[Almost in every Purāṇa there are found a number of non-Pāṇinian uses which generally pertain to hiatus, re-sandhi (or double sandhi), remodelling of the basic forms of some words on the lines of Prākṛta-forms, inflectional and conjugational forms influenced by Prākṛta, and also actual Prākṛta forms found incidentally written by scribes in some of the old manuscripts of the Purāṇas. These non-Pāṇinian uses are often held as *āraṇya prayogas*. But in the present article it is shown that they are mostly due to the exigencies of metre, or to the influence of Prākṛta or to both. For this purpose, the article has divided non-Pāṇinian uses of the Purāṇas into five main heads with several sub-heads. Each head and sub-head is, then, discussed with appropriate illustrations from the printed editions and manuscripts of several important Purāṇas. Editors and scribes have often tried to emend these non-Pāṇinian uses. Such emendations have also been illustrated here.

On account of some Prākṛta or Prākṛta-influenced forms met with in the Purāṇas, Pargiter held that the Purāṇas, and specially their genealogical chapters, were originally composed in Prākṛta, and later on Sanskritized by the Purāṇic redactors. The present article has also briefly discussed this point. According to the view expressed in this article, there might have been parallel genealogical literature composed in Prākṛta by some Sūtas and Māgadhās attached to royal courts, and the Purāṇic redactors might have also incorporated a few of these Prākṛta ślokas into the genealogical Sanskrit accounts of the Purāṇas, and hence some stray Prākṛta uses in the Purāṇas. A.S.G.]

अथ पुराणेषु वर्त्तमानानाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां विचारः प्रस्तूयते । प्रायः सर्वेष्वेव पुराणेषु बहवोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगा विद्यन्ते । आर्षास्ते प्रयोगा इति मत्वा तेषां साधुत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते । कामं सन्तु तेषां मध्ये कतिचित् प्रयोगा आर्षा अपि, परन्तु ते सर्वेऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगा आर्षा एवेति मतं तु न समीचीनं प्रतीयते, अनेकेषाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां तत्र छन्दोऽनुरोध-प्राकृतभाषाप्रभावाद्य-नेककारणमूलकत्वात् । अपि च, भगवता पाणिनिना 'आर्ष' इति शब्दो वेदे एव नियमित इति तस्य 'सम्बुद्धौ शाकल्यस्येतावनार्षे' (पा० १।१।१६) प्रभृतिभिः सूत्रैर् ज्ञायते । वेदेतरवाङ्मये च तेन 'अनार्ष' इति शब्दोऽत्र प्रयुक्त इति तु स्पष्टमेव । वेदसंहिताः, ब्राह्मणानि, आरण्यकानि, उपनिषदश्चेत्येतद् वाङ्मयमेव वेदे ( छन्दसि ) अन्तर्भवति; काशिकादिश्रुतिषु छन्दोविषय-काण्युदाहरणानि च अस्मादेव वैदिकवाङ्मयाद् उद्धृत्य प्रदत्तानि । अतः पुराणेषु प्राप्यमाणा ये एव वैदिका वैदिकव्याकरणानुसारिणो वा प्रयोगास् ते एव तत्र वस्तुतः 'आर्ष' प्रयोगा मन्तव्याः; यथा भागवते 'भस्मनि हुतम्' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'भस्मन् हुतम्' ( १।१५।२१ ), 'प्रतिहर्तुम्' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'प्रतिहर्त्तवे' ( ३।५।४७ ), तथा 'धीमहि' ( १।१।१ ), 'अभिधीमहि' ( ८।३।२ ) इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः ।

वेदे 'मिस्' विभक्तौ अकारान्तशब्दानां 'पूर्वेभिः' ..... 'नूतनैः' ( ऋ० वे० १।१।२ ) तथा 'कर्णेभिः' ..... 'अङ्गैः' ( ऋ० वे० १।८९।८ ) इत्यादय उभयथा प्रयोगा एकत्रापि प्राप्यन्ते । अकारान्तप्रातिपदिकानां तृतीया-बहुवचने 'मिस्'न्ताः प्रयोगास् तु पाणिनिमतेन छन्दस्येव भवन्ति बहुलं, न तु लौकिके संस्कृते । लौकिकसंस्कृते तु केवलं 'कप्पूरैः', 'मानसैः' इत्यादय 'पेस्'न्ताः प्रयोगाः शिष्टाः, प्राकृते च पुनः 'कप्पूरेहि', 'माणसेहि' इत्यादयो 'मिस्'न्ता एव प्रयोगा दृश्यन्ते । पुनश्च, वेदे यथा—अकारान्त-नपुंसकलिङ्ग-शब्दस्य प्रथमाद्वितीययोर्बहुवचने 'विश्वान्यद्भुता' ( ऋ० वे० १।२५।११ ), विश्वा भुवनानि' ( ऋ० वे० १।१५।४।२, ४ ), 'विश्वानि दुरितानि' ( ऋ० वे० ५।८२।५ ) इत्यादय उभयथा प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते, तथा पालिप्राकृतेऽपि 'फला', 'फलानि' इत्यादयो द्विविधाः प्रयोगा विद्यन्ते । पुनः, वेदे असमासे इव

अनञ्पूर्वे समासेऽपि ( अर्थात् उपसर्गपूर्वकाद्धातोरपि ) 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशः क्वचित् भवति, एवं च यथा असमासे 'हुत्वा' ( ऋ० वे० १०।१४।८ ), कृत्वा ( १०।१५ ) इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः, तथा समासेऽपि 'परिधापयित्वा'<sup>२</sup> 'प्रत्यर्थयित्वा'<sup>३</sup> प्रभृतयः प्रयोगा वेदे वर्तन्ते । एवमेव पालिभाषायामपि 'पचित्वा' 'उप्पतित्वा' इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते । वेदे च समासे इव असमासेऽपि क्वचित् 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशः साधुः, यथा 'निषद्य' ( ऋ० वे० १०।१४।५ ), 'उद्घृत्य'<sup>४</sup> इत्यादयः प्रयोगाः, एवम् 'अर्च्य'<sup>५</sup>, 'अज्य'<sup>६</sup> इत्यादयोऽपि प्रयोगा वेदे कल्पसूत्रेषु च उपलभ्यन्ते । प्राकृते तु पुनः 'क्त्वा' स्थाने समासेऽसमासे सर्वत्रैव 'ल्यप्' आदेशो दृश्यते, यथा 'उप्पाडिअ' ( संस्कृते-उत्पाद्य ), 'उवविसिअ' ( सं०-उपविश्य ), 'परिहरिअ' ( सं०-परिहृत्य ), 'भविअ' ( सं०-भूत्वा ), 'भणिअ' ( सं०-भणित्वा ), 'जाणिअ' ( सं०-ज्ञात्वा ), 'णाइअ' ( सं०-नीत्वा ) इत्यादिषु प्रयोगेषु । एवं स्थिते, यदि पुराणेषु 'येहि' ( =येभिः ), 'वर्षा' ( =वर्षाणि ), 'उत्सादयित्वा' ( =उत्साद्य ), 'प्रवर्तयित्वा' ( =प्रवर्त्य ), 'गृह्य' ( =गृहीत्वा ), पूज्य ( =पूजयित्वा ) प्रभृतयोऽपाणिनीयाः प्रयोगा अपि प्राप्यन्ते<sup>७</sup>, तर्हि किमेते प्रयोगा आर्षाः, उत प्राकृतप्रतिरूपाः प्राकृतानुकारिणो वा, छन्दोऽनुरोधजन्या वा—इत्ययं प्रश्नः समाधेयः ।

इदमप्यत्रावधेयं यत् पुराणानि खलु परमर्षिणा व्यासेन लोकहितार्थाय संकलितानि रचितानि वा । अतो वर्णजातिलिङ्गादिभेदमनपेक्ष्य सर्वेषामेव जनानां पुराणानां पठने श्रवणे चाधिकारोऽभ्युपगम्यते । अतएव पुराणवाचकाः सूता व्यासाश्च जनसंसदि पुराणानि वाचयन्ति स्म । जनसामान्यस्य च भाषा सदैव

२. 'कुष्णं वासो यजमानं परिधापयित्वा' ( पा० ७।१।३८, काशि० )

३. 'प्रत्यञ्जमर्कं प्रत्यर्थयित्वा' ( तत्रैव )

४. 'उद्घृत्य जुहोति' ( तत्रैव )

५. 'अर्च्यं तान् देवान् गतः' ( तत्रैव )

६. कल्पसूत्रेषु चापि 'आज्येनाक्षिणी अज्य' इति । ( पा० ७।१।३८, सि० कौ०,

मुबोधिनीव्याख्या )

७. उदाहरणानि तूपरिष्ठाभिर्वेदयिष्यन्ते ।

८. 'इह लोकहितार्थाय संलिप्तं परमर्षिणा' ( मत्स्य०, ५३।५६ पृ० )



प्रायेण प्राकृतम् आसीत् । वेदेऽपि 'तितउ'<sup>९</sup> प्रभृतयः प्राकृतप्रतिरूपाः शब्दा उपलभ्यन्ते । भगवता पाणिनिना स्वसूत्रेषु 'भाषायाम्' इति शब्दप्रयोगस्तु शिष्टविशेषाणां भाषां संस्कृतमधिकृत्यैव कृतः, न तु जनसामान्यस्य भाषामधिकृत्य । लोकहितार्थं लौकिकसंस्कृते उपनिबद्धं सूतव्यासादिपरम्परया च लोके प्रचार्यमाणं पुराणवाङ्मयं लोकभाषया प्राकृतेन प्रभावितमभूदिति सम्भावना तु नापलाप्या । पुनश्च, पुराणानि खलु काले काले प्रतिभासम्पन्नैः सूतैर् व्यसैर् अन्यैर् वा पुराणविज्ञैः कविभिः परिवर्द्धितानि संक्षिप्तानि विपरिवर्तितानि वा—इति प्राचीन-पुराणकोशानां सम्यग् अध्ययनेन स्पष्टं प्रतीयते । तस्माद् रचनाकाले प्रति-संस्करणकाले वा पौराणिकी भाषा प्राकृतप्रभावेण अस्पृष्टा नासीदित्यपि निश्चित-प्रायमेव । प्राचीन-पुराणपुस्तकानां कैश्चन प्राकृतज्ञैर् लेखकैरपि पुराणानां कानिचित् संस्कृतपदानि ज्ञानतोऽज्ञानतो वा प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि कृतानि, परवर्त्ति-भिश्च लिपिकारैस् तानि तथैव प्रतिलिपीकृतानि च । पुनश्च, पुराणेषूपलभ्यमानानां राजवंशावलीनां केचिद् अंशाः सूतमागधादिभिर् मूलतः प्राकृते एव रचिताः स्युः, पश्चाच्च तैः शाः पुराणप्रतिसंस्कृतृभिः संस्कृते परिवर्त्य पुराणेषु संयोजिताः स्युः इत्यपि संभावना वर्त्तते ।<sup>१०</sup> अत एव पुराणेषु क्वचिद् द्वितीयास्थाने प्रथमा विभक्तिः प्रयुक्ता दृश्यते,<sup>११</sup> परन्तु संस्कृतवाक्यरचनायाम् एतादृशः प्रयोगोऽसाधु-रेव, प्राकृते तु प्रथमाद्वितीययोः प्रायेण समानरूपत्वात् साधुरेव तत्रेदृशः प्रयोगः । पुराणेषु केषुचित् श्लोकेषु छन्दोभङ्गदोषोऽप्यपाणिनीयप्रयोगेण सह प्राप्यते, परन्तु यदि ते श्लोकाः पुनः प्राकृते परिवर्त्येरन्, तर्हि तत्र छन्दोदोषस्या-भावो जायते, असाधुप्रयोगश्च साधुः सम्पद्यते ।<sup>१२</sup> तस्मात् स्पष्टमेतत् यत्

९. द्रष्टव्यम्—ऋ० वे० १०।७।१।२. उणादिसूत्रेषु यद्यपि 'तितउ' शब्दस्य √तन्+उउ—इति व्युत्पत्तिः कल्पिता, तथापि मूलतोऽयं शब्दः प्राकृतप्रतिरूपक एव ।

१०. अपि च द्रष्टव्यम् - पाजिटर, पुराण-टैक्सट आफ दि डाइनेस्टीज आफ दि कलि-एज', परिशिष्ट १ । निखिलान्येव राजवंशावलीप्रकरणानि मूलतः प्राकृते एव रचितानि पश्चाच्च तानि संस्कृते विपरिवर्तितानि—इति पाजिटरमहोदयोऽत्र मन्यते । पुराणेषूपलभ्य-मानानां राजवंशावलीनां केचिदंशाः मूलतः प्राकृते रचिता आसन्, ते च पश्चात् संस्कृते परिवर्त्य पूर्ववर्त्तैः शेषैः संस्कृतशैः सह पुराणेषु संयोजिताः—इति मत्तं तु लेखेऽस्मिन् प्रतिपाद्यते ।

११, १२. उदाहरणानि त्वन्ने द्रष्टव्यानि ।

पुराणेषु प्राकृतमूलात्मकस्य अंशस्य प्राकृतच्छायारूपे संस्कृते विपरिवर्तनादपि केषुचित् स्थलेषु छन्दोभङ्गदोषो विद्यते ।<sup>१३</sup>

निष्कर्षस्तु—पुराणेषु केचिद् अपणिनीयप्रयोगाः प्राकृतप्रभाविताः प्राकृत-  
च्छायारूपा वा, अन्ये च छन्दोऽनुरोधाद् अपणिनीयाः संजाताः । तत्र क्वचिद्  
आर्षा अपि प्रयोगा वर्तन्ते, परन्तु ते विरला एव । पुराणेष्वपणिनीयप्रयोगाणां  
सद्भावे तु बहुत्र छन्दोभङ्गप्रसङ्गपरिहार एव मुख्यो हेतुर् इति नृपरिधान्  
स्पष्टीक्रियते ।

एतादृशान् प्राकृतच्छायारूपान् कौञ्चिद् अपणिनीयप्रयोगान् दृष्ट्वैव  
प्रसिद्धपुराणविदुषः पार्जितरमहोदयस्य मतं संजातं यद् मत्स्यवायुब्रह्माण्डादीनि  
पुराणानि मूलतः प्राकृतभाषायामेव रचितान्यासन्, पश्चाच्च तानि प्राकृतच्छायारूपे  
संस्कृते परिवर्तितानि । भारतीयवाङ्मयमन्तरा पार्जितरस्य क्षत्रियपरम्पराविपक्षः  
सिद्धान्त एवास्य मतस्याधारोऽस्ति । भारतीयवाङ्मये द्वे परम्परे आस्ताम्—  
ब्राह्मणपरम्परा, क्षत्रियपरम्परा च; ब्राह्मणपरम्परायां वेदब्राह्मणारण्यकप्रभृतयो ग्रन्थाः  
संस्कृते एव रचिता आसन्, क्षत्रियपरम्परायाः ( सूतपरम्परायाः ) पुराणादयो  
ग्रन्थास्तु प्राकृते रचिताः, पश्चाच्च ते ब्राह्मणजातीयैः प्रतिसंस्कर्तुभिः संस्कृते विपरि-  
वर्तिताः—इति पार्जितरमहोदयस्य सिद्धान्तः ।<sup>१४</sup> पार्जितरमहोदयस्य मतद्वयं  
कोथोपाह्वेन आङ्गलविदुषा<sup>१५</sup> 'जैकौवि' नाम्ना जर्मनविदुषा<sup>१६</sup> च निराकृतम्, तथा  
च पुसाल्करमहोदयेनापि मतस्यास्य निराकरणं क्रियते ।<sup>१७</sup> तस्मात् पार्जितरमतं तु  
विवादास्पदमेव तिष्ठति । अस्तु । प्रकृतमधुनाऽनुसरामः ।

१३. प्राकृतश्लोकस्य संस्कृते विपरिवर्तनम्, अथवा प्राकृतच्छायारूपश्लोकस्य  
निर्माणं प्रायेण छन्दोभङ्गस्य कारणं भवति । अतएव राजशेखरकृतबालभारतस्य ( निर्णय-  
सागरप्रेस-संस्करण, १९२७ ) द्वितीयाङ्कस्य तृतीयश्लोकस्य टिप्पण्या 'प्राकृतच्छायारूपो-  
ऽयं श्लोकः, अतएवछन्दोभङ्गः' इति निर्दिष्टम् ।

१४. पार्जितर, 'एन्शियेन्ट इंडियन हिस्टारिकल ट्रेडिशन' पृ० ५-१८ ।

१५. ब्र०—'जरनल आफ रायल एशियाटिक सोसाइटी' १९१८, ५०

१०२८-३० ।

१६. ब्र०—पुसाल्कर, 'स्टडीज इन दि एपिक्स एंड दि पुराणज', पृ० : ६-३० ।

पुराणेषु प्राप्ता अपाणिनीयप्रयोगा अधोनिर्दिष्टेषु विभागेषु विभज्य विचार्यन्ते—

१. स्वरसंधिसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) विवृत्तिः (hiatus)

(आ) द्विःसंधिः (double sandhi)

२. प्रातिपदिकसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

३. सुबन्तपदसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) कारकविभक्तिसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(१) सम्प्रदाने सप्तमी

(२) 'नमः' योगे सप्तमी

(३) प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि विभक्तिरूपाणि

(आ) लिङ्गव्यत्ययः ।

४. तिङन्तपदसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) लङि 'अट्', 'आट्' आगमयोरभावः

(आ) आत्मनेपदस्य स्थाने परस्मैपदप्रयोगः

(१) कर्तृवाच्ये, (२) कर्मवाच्ये

५. 'क्त्वा'ऽन्तसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) समासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्'-आदेशाभावः

(आ) असमासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य ल्यप्

पुराणानां मुद्रितपुस्तकेषु बहवो अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः सम्पादकैः संशोधिताः— इति प्रतीयते । परन्तु प्राचीनकोशेषु प्रायेण मौलिका एव ते प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते । क्वचित्तु तेष्वपि लिपिकारैः केचिद् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः स्वबुद्ध्यनुसारेण संशोधिताः । अतो येषु हस्तलेखेषु ईदृशाः संशोधिताः प्रयोगाः प्राप्यन्ते, ते प्रायशो अर्वाचीनतरा एव मन्तव्याः, तस्माद् ईदृशानां कोशानां तान् प्रयोगान् अन्तरा प्रामाण्यं नाभ्युपेयम् ।



[ अत्र समासे नित्यसंधेरपि परिहारेण विवृत्तिः केवलं छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव ।  
संधौ कृते तु, अनुष्टुप्पादेऽस्मिन् सप्ताक्षराण्येव स्युः । ]

(४) मूत्रं कृतवोषस्पृशन्ति अकृत्वा पादधावनम् । ( मत्स्य०-कोशेषु )  
,, ,, ०न्ति चाकृत्वा ,, । ( मत्स्य०, १३१।४४ पृ )

(५) आसूर्यं च अशामहे । ( D<sub>3-7</sub> )  
०र्यं तदशामहे । ( D<sub>10, 11</sub> )  
०र्यं तदशीमहि । ( मत्स्य०, २०४।७ उ )

(६) सांख्ययोगौ उभावपि ( D<sub>19</sub> )  
सांख्ययोगावुभावपि ( D<sub>1, 2, 10, 13, 14</sub> )  
सांख्ययोगौ भवामवौ ( मत्स्य०, २४८।१७ उ )

(७) नारा इत्युच्यते आपो ऋषिभिस् ... । ( N<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>3-6, 12</sub> )  
,, ,, ०ते ह्यापो बृषिभिस् ... ( मत्स्य०, २४८।४२ उ )

[ यद्यपि 'आपो ऋषिभिस्' अत्र ऋवर्णे रेफध्वनिं मत्वा कोशेषु तथैव  
संधिः कृतः, अन्यथा 'आप ऋषिभिस्' इति संधिः कर्तव्य आसीत्, अतएव  
कोशेषु विवृत्तिरत्र न मन्यते । परन्तु मत्स्यपुराणस्य आनन्दाश्रमसम्पादकैरत्रापि  
विवृत्तिं मत्वा 'हि' निपातस्य प्रयोगेण सा निवारिता । ]

(८) पुरतो यदुसिंहस्य अमोघस्य । ( वामन०, केषुचित् कोशेषु )  
,, ०स्य ह्यमोघस्य । ( वामन०, ६५।४८ उ )

(९) कुण्डिनं न प्रवेक्ष्यामि अहत्वा ... । ( ब्रह्म०, १६६।६ पृ )

(१०) पुष्करे तु अनं दृष्ट्वा ... । ( पद्म०, ५।२६।२४१ उ )

अत्र प्रदत्तैरुदाहरणैः स्पष्टमेतद् यत् छन्दोदोषपरिहारयैव विवृत्तिरत्र  
समाश्रिता आसीत् । सा च केषुचित् कोशेषु मुद्रितपुस्तकेषु च निपातप्रयोगा-  
दिना संशोधिता वर्तते ।

यत्र पूर्वनिर्दिष्ट (पा० ८।३।१९)-सूत्रानुसारेण विवृत्तिः पाणिनि-  
सम्पत्ताऽपि वर्तते स्म, तत्रापि विवृत्तिम् असहमानैर्लिपिकारैः सम्पादकैर्वा निपातानां  
प्रयोगः कृतः, पाठभेदो वा समाश्रितः; यथा—

अनामया अशोकाश्च ..... । ( Ś<sub>1</sub>-शारदाकोशे )

०या ह्यशोकाश्च ..... । ( मत्स्य०, ११४।६५ पु, कोट्येष्टु च )

शक्रविष्णू इवापरौ । ( मत्स्य०, ३२।६ उ )

विष्णुशक्राविवापरौ । ( D<sub>10</sub> कोशे )

(आ) द्विः संधिः (Double Sandhi)

[भगवतः पाणिनेर् मते ८।३।१९ प्रभृतिभिः सूत्रैर् अवर्णपूर्वयोः पदान्त्यकार-  
वकारयोर्लोपे कृतेऽपि ८।२।१ सूत्रानुसारेण तत्र लोपस्यासिद्धत्वान् पूर्वपरयोः  
स्वरयोः पुनः संधिर् न भवति । परन्तु पुराणेषु तादृशेष्वपि केषुचित् स्थलेषु  
पुनः संधिर् (द्विः संधिर्) दृश्यते । द्विःसंधिश्चायं प्रायेण छन्दोरोपपत्ति-  
हारार्थमेवाश्रितः । अत्रापि क्वचित् लिपिकारैः सम्पादकैश्च निपातप्रयोगादिना  
द्विः संधिः संशोधितः । ]

### उदाहरणानि

(१) सर्वानन्तफलाः प्रोक्ताः ( मत्स्य०, ७४।४, कोट्येष्टु च )

[ सर्वानन्तफलाः, <सर्वा अनन्त०, <सर्वाः ( ०स् > ०ब् ) अनन्त० ।  
अत्रानुष्टुप्पादे नवाक्षरप्रसङ्गपरिहारार्थं द्विः संधिः ]

(२) तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायात् ( अग्नि०, १८५।१३ उ )

[ तस्याग्रतः, <तस्या (=देव्याः) अग्रतः, <तस्याः ( ०स् > ०ब् ) अग्रतः ]

(३) विरेमुरेवं च सुराभिधाय । ( मत्स्य०, १५६।१८ )

[ सुराभिधाय, <सुरा अभिधाय, <सुराः ( ०स् > ०ब् ) अभिधाय ]

(४) मृतश्च राजा स पुरुरवाभूत् । ( भावन०, ७१।४ उ )

[ पुरुरवाभूत्, <पुरुरवा अभूत्, <पुरुरवाः ( ०स् > ०ब् ) अभूत् ]

(५) हृष्टोत्तीर्य रथात्सद्यः । (ब्रह्माण्ड०, २।३१।२८ उ)

[ हृष्टोत्तीर्य, <हृष्ट उत्तीर्य, <हृष्टः ( हृष्ट्य् ) उत्तीर्य ]

(६) कपालिनैकवीराय । ( ७ कोशेषु )

कपालिने च वीराय । ( मत्स्य०, ४७।१३७ उ )

[ कपालिनैकवीराय, <कपालिन एकवीराय, <कपालिने एकवीराय ]

(७) तथाऽर्यम्णेति नैर्ऋते ( ७ कोशेषु )

,, ंम्णे च नैर्ऋते ( मत्स्य०, ७६।६ उ )

[ अर्यम्णेति, <अर्यम्णा इति, <अर्यम्णे इति ]

## २. प्रातिपदिकसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

[पुराणेषु प्राकृतप्रभावेण छन्दोऽनुरोधेन च क्वचित् 'तेजस्', 'यशस्', 'शिरस्', 'श्रेयस्', 'सरस्' प्रभृतोनाम् 'अस्'-अन्तशब्दानां सकारलोपं कृत्वा तेषाम् अकारान्तत्वं ( स्त्रियाम्-आकारान्तत्वं ) कृतम् । एवम्, अन्येऽपि प्राकृतप्रभाविताः प्रातिपदिकसम्बन्धिनो अपाणिनीयविकाराः पुराणेषु दृश्यन्ते । ]

### उदाहरणानि—

(१) अष्टतेजाः स्त्रियो जाताः ( मत्स्य०, १८८।१० )

[ अत्र 'अस्'-अन्तस्य 'अष्टतेजस्' इति शब्दस्य स्त्रियां 'अष्टतेजा' इत्याकारान्तत्वं कृत्वा तस्य जसि रूपं प्रयुक्तम् । 'अष्टतेजसः' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'अष्टतेजाः' इत्यपाणिनीयेन पाठेन अत्र नवाक्षरप्रसङ्गपरिहारोऽपि कृतः । प्राकृतप्रभावस्त्वत्र स्पष्ट एव । ]

(२) नल्वंशप्रसूतास्ते वीर्यवन्तो महायशाः । ( वायुपु०, ६६।१०० )

[ अत्र 'महायशाः' इति प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकः पाठः वायुपुराणस्य इंडिया आफिसपुस्तकालयस्य E 3589 संख्यके कोशे वर्तते । अस्य कोशस्य

लेखनकालः १४८३ ई० ।<sup>१९</sup> प्राकृतप्रभावोऽप्यत्र वर्तते, छन्दोदेशपरिहाराध-  
मप्येष पाठः समाश्रितः ]

(३) मासि मार्गशिरे नरैः ( वामन०, ६५।४०, तत्कोशेषु च ।

[ अत्र 'मार्गशिरसि' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'मार्गशिरे' इति प्रयोगस्तु  
नवाक्षरप्रसङ्गपरिहाराय प्रतीयते । कोशद्वये 'मार्गशीर्षे नरोत्तमैः' इति पाठो  
वर्तते । ]

(४) जगतः श्रेयकारणम् ( वामन०, ४११ )

[ अत्र 'श्रेयःकारणम्' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'श्रेयकारणम्' इति पाठस्तु  
अनुष्टुप्-पादे पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वकरणार्थम् । ]

(५) तथैव सरमाहात्म्यं ब्रूहि ( वामन०, ४३।२ ।

(६) पप्रच्छ सरमाहात्म्यं ( ४३।५ )

(७) ब्रूहि मे सरमाहात्म्यं ( ४३।६ )

[ अत्र त्रिष्वपि स्थलेषु 'सरो०' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'सर०' इति  
प्रयोगोऽत्र अनुष्टुभि पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वकरणार्थम् । यत्र तादृश्यपञ्चा न वर्तन्ते  
तत्र 'सरस्-' ( 'महत्सरस्तेन पूर्णः' वामन०, ४३।३८ ), 'सरो-' ( 'प्रमाणं  
सरसो ब्रूहि' २२।४८ ), 'सरो-' ( रुद्रेण च सरोमध्यं प्रविष्टेन- ३२।५८ )  
प्रभृतयः प्रयोगा एव दृश्यन्ते । ]

(८) दुहितं प्रशशंस च ( मत्स्य०, १५४।२६, कोट्टेषु च ।

[ अत्र 'दुहितरं' इति पाठस्य स्थाने 'दुहिता' इति पाठो नवाक्षरप्रसङ्ग-  
परिहाराय । अस्मिन् स्थले शारदालिपिकोशे 'प्रशशंस दुहितरं' इति संशोभितः  
पाठो विद्यते । अन्यत्रापि च मात्स्ये तत्कोशेषु च 'वधाच्च दुहितुर्मम' इति  
पाठ एव वर्तते । ]

(९) विभ्रान्ताय महान्ताय ( मत्स्य०, ४७।१५१ ; तत्कोशेषु च )



[ अत्र 'विभ्रान्ताय' इत्यस्य पदस्य सन्निधौ तद्ध्वनिसाम्यार्थं 'महते' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'महान्ताय' इति पाठो धृतः । अनेन पाठेन चात्र छन्दः-पादपूर्चिरपि भवति; अन्यथा 'महते' इति पाठेन सप्ताक्षराण्येव स्युः । पुनश्च 'महान्ताय' इति पाठे पालिप्राकृतप्रभावोऽपि दृश्यते, पालिप्राकृते 'महत्' इत्यस्य 'महन्त' इति प्रातिपादिकरूपो भवति । ]

(१०) स्वाहाय च स्वधाय च ( मत्स्य०, ४७।१५७ पृ )

[ अत्र शिवस्तोत्रे 'स्वाहा' 'स्वधा' इत्यन्ययशब्दयोर् अकारान्तत्वं कृत्वा तयोश्चतुर्थ्यन्ते पदे शिवस्य विशेषणत्वेनाभिधानत्वेन वा प्रयुक्ते स्तः; अग्रे तृतीये पादे 'वषट्कारात्मने चैव' इति पदस्य वर्त्तमानत्वात् । 'स्वाहा' 'स्वधा', 'वषट्' इति त्रीण्यपि पदानि स्वरादिगणे पठितानि ।

### ३. सुबन्तसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) कारकविभक्तिसम्बन्धिनः

[ पुराणेषु क्वचित् सम्प्रदानेऽपि चतुर्थीस्थाने सप्तमी विभक्तिः प्रयुक्ता दृश्यते, क्वचिच्च 'नमः'—शब्दयोगेऽपि चतुर्थीस्थाने सप्तमी दृश्यते, क्वचित्तु प्राकृतप्रभावाद्धेतोर् द्वितीयायामपि प्रथमावद् प्रयोगा विद्यन्ते । अन्योऽपि विभक्तिव्यत्ययः पुराणेषु- यत्र तत्र प्राप्यते । ]

(१) सम्प्रदाने सप्तमी—

मसूरात्रं कुजे दद्यात् ( D<sub>12-14</sub> )

मसूरांश्च कुजे दद्यात् ( D<sub>8-6</sub> )

अस्य स्थाने—

गुडौदनं च भौमाय ( N<sub>1</sub>—नेवारीकोशे )

अङ्गारकाय संयावं ( मत्स्य०, ६३।१६, केषुचित् तरकोशेषु च )

(२) 'नमः' योगे सप्तमी—

प्रणवे ऋग्यजुः साम्ने . . . तुभ्यं मन्त्रात्मने नमः ।

( मत्स्य०, ४७।१५८ )

[ अत्र '०साक्षे', '०त्मने' इत्युभयत्र चतुर्थीविभक्तौ एकारान्तत्वात् तद्ध्वनिसाम्याय 'प्रणवे' इत्यत्रापि सप्तमीविभक्तेर् एकारान्तं रूपं समाश्रितमिति संभावना वर्तते । तथा सति विभक्तिव्यत्ययोऽत्र उपेक्षितः । अनेन छन्दो-भङ्गोऽप्यत्र परिहृतो भवति । ]

### (३) प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि विभक्तिरूपाणि\*

“मागधानां महावीर्यो विश्वस्फाणिर्मविप्यति ।

उत्साद्य पार्थिवान् सर्वान् सोऽन्यान् वर्णान् करिष्यति ॥

कैवर्त्तान् पद्मकांश्चैव पुलिन्दान् ब्राह्मणांस्तथा ।

स्थापयिष्यति राजानो नानादेशेषु ते जनाः ।

विश्वस्फाणिर्महासत्त्वो युद्धे विष्णुसमो बली”<sup>२०</sup>

( वायु०, ६१३७७-३७८ )

[ विश्वस्फाणिर् नानादेशेषु ते जना ( = तान् जनान्, कैवर्त्तादीन् ) राजानो ( = राज्ञः, द्वितीयाबहुवचनम् ) स्थापयिष्यति-इत्यन्वयः । अत्र यद्यपि ब्रह्माण्डे ( ३।७४।१२२ ) ‘स्थापयिष्यन्ति’ इति बहुवचनपाठो विद्यते, तथा वायुपुराणस्य वैकटेश्वरसंस्करणेऽपि ( उत्तरा०, अ० ३७, श्लो० ३७३ पू० ) ‘स्थापयिष्यन्ति राजानो नानादेशेषु तेजसा’ इति पाठः परिवर्त्तितः, तथाप्यत्र प्रकरणे ‘स्थापयिष्यति’ इत्येकवचनमेव साधु, ‘विश्वस्फाणिः’ इति कर्त्रा तस्यान्वयात् । पुनश्च, विष्णुपुराणे ( ४।२४।६१-६३ ; जी० वि० संस्करणं ४।२४।१७, १८ ) तथा भागवतपुराणे ( १।२।१।३६, ३७ ) अत्र प्रकरणे ‘स्थापयिष्यति’ इत्येकवचनपाठ एव वर्तते । अतः, ब्रह्माण्डपुराणे वायुपुराणस्य वैकटेश्वरसंस्करणे च बहुवचनपाठो भ्रममूलकत्वात् प्रामादिक एव, तत्र ‘राजानो’ इत्यनेन तस्य मिथ्यान्वयात् । वस्तुतस्तु, ‘राजानो’, ‘ते’, ‘जना’ इति त्रीण्यपि पदानि प्राकृतद्वितीयाबहुवचनरूपाण्येव, प्राकृते प्रायेण प्रथमा-

\* अस्य ग्रंथस्याधारः प्रचानतः पाजिटर्कृतः ‘पुराण टेक्स्ट आफ दि डाइनेस्टोज आफ दि कलि-एज’ नामको ग्रन्थः, विशेषतस्तु तस्य परिशिष्ट (१) भागः ।

२०. ब्र०—पाजिटर्, ‘पु० टै०’, पृ० ५२। प्राचीनकोशानाम् आधारेण पाजिटर्महोदयैः स्वीकृतोऽर्थं पाठः ।

द्वितीययोः समानरूपत्वात् । पुराणेषु च संस्कृतेऽपि प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकाणि त्रीण्यपीमानि पदानि तथैव प्रयुक्तानि । अतोऽत्र संस्कृतविभक्तिषु प्राकृतप्रभावः स्पष्टः । परवर्तिभिश्च लेखकैरिमं प्राकृतप्रभावमविज्ञायैव नाना पाठभेदा अत्रोद्भाविताः ।<sup>२१</sup> ]

अथ मगधराजानो भवितारो वदामि ते । ( भागवत०, ६।२२।४५ उ )

[ अत्र तु स्पष्टमेव पालिप्राकृतस्य प्रभावो लक्ष्यते । पालिप्राकृते द्वितीयायां बहुवचने 'राजन्' शब्दस्य 'राजानो', 'भवितु' शब्दस्य च 'भवितारो' इति रूपं भवति । एतादृशः प्रयोगस् तत्रैव साधुः । संस्कृते त्वोदशो वाक्यविन्यासः सर्वथैवापाणिनीयः ]

राजा घोषस्ततश्चापि वर्षाणि भविता त्रयः । ( ब्रह्माण्ड०, ३।७।१५३ उ )

[ अत्र प्रकरणे वायुपुराणेऽपि ( ९९।३४० ) 'वर्षाणि भविता त्रयः' इत्येव पाठो वर्तते । 'त्रि' संस्कृतशब्दस्य प्राकृते प्रथमाद्वितीययोस्त्रिषु लिङ्गेषु 'तओ' इति बहुवचनरूपं भवति । अत्र 'त्रयः' इति रूपं 'तओ' इति प्राकृतरूपस्य प्राकृतप्रतिरूपिका संस्कृतच्छायैव । अन्यथा 'वर्षाणि' इत्यस्य योगे 'त्रीणि' इत्येव शुद्धसंस्कृतपाठः स्यात् । वायुपुराणस्यैके कोशे ( Jones Ms; W6b, T. ६8 ) अयं पाठ एवं संशोधितः—'त्रीणि वर्षाणि भविता राजा घोषवसुर्नृपः' ।<sup>२२</sup> ]

मृगेन्द्रः स्वातिकर्णस्तु भविष्यति समाल्लयः । ( मत्स्य०, १७३।७ पु )

[ अत्रापि 'त्रयः' शब्दः 'तओ' इति प्राकृतरूपस्य प्राकृतप्रतिरूपिका संस्कृतच्छायैव । शुद्धसंस्कृते तु 'समाः' इति विशेष्यस्य योगे तस्य संख्या-विशेषणरूपेण स्त्रियां द्वितीयाबहुवचने 'तिस्रः' इत्येव शुद्धः पाठः स्यात् । ]

अष्टाविंशति तथा वर्षा पालको भविता नृपः । ( मत्स्य०, कोशे )<sup>२३</sup>

२१. द्र०—पाजिटर, 'पु० टै०' पु० ५२, टिप्पण्यः ३३-४२ ।

२२. पाजिटर, पु० टै०, पु० ३२, टि० ३२ । Ms. ०Vā.

२३. Wilson 21, Auf. Cat. No. 95. द्र०-पाजिटर, पु० टै०, पु० १६, टि० २६ ।

[ 'अष्टाविंशति तथा वर्षा (= वर्षाणि) ' इति पाठेनात्रानुष्टुप्पादे नवाक्षराणि भवन्ति । प्राकृते तु अस्य स्थाने 'अष्टावीसं तथा वस्सा' इति षाठो भवति, अनेन प्राकृतपाठेन च पादेऽस्मिन् अष्टाक्षराण्येव भवन्ति । अतो मूलपाठस्तु प्राकृते एव निबद्ध आसीदिति पार्जितरमहोदयस्य मतम् ।<sup>२४</sup> संवत्सरवाचकस्य 'वर्ष' शब्दस्य 'वर्षा' इति द्वितीयाबहुवचनरूपं तु 'वस्सा' इति प्राकृतरूपस्य प्रतिरूपमेव । पालिभाषायामपि 'फल' प्रभृतीनाम् अकारान्तनपुंसकशब्दानां प्रथमाद्वितीययोर्बहुवचने 'फला' 'फलानि' इति द्विविधानि रूपाणि भवन्ति । मत्स्यपुराणस्यानन्दाश्रमसंस्करणे ( २७२ । ३ उ ) अयं पाठः इत्थं संशोधितः प्राप्यते—'अष्टाविंशति वर्षाणि पालको भविता नृपः' । परन्त्वत्रापि 'अष्टाविंशति' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने 'अष्टाविंशति' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठश्च छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वार्थं स्वीकृतः । ]

अष्टाविंशति मैथिलाः ( ब्रह्माण्ड०, ३।७।११३७ ; वायु०, ६६।३२४ )

[ अत्रापि 'अष्टाविंशति' इति पाठः प्राकृतानुसारी ; प्राकृते विसर्गस्थाभावात् । पञ्चमवर्णस्य लघुत्वकरणाद्यैव अयं पाठोऽत्र गृहीतः । ]

वृद्धवाक्यौषधा नूनं कुर्वन्ति किल निर्विषम् । ( वामन०, ५ कोशेषु )<sup>२५</sup>

[ अत्रापि 'औषध' इत्यकारान्तनपुंसकशब्दस्य 'औषधा' इति प्रथमा बहुवचनरूपं प्राकृतप्रतिरूपकमेव प्रतीयते ।<sup>२६</sup> लौकिके संस्कृते तु 'औषधानि' इत्येव साधु । अतएव वैकटेश्वरसंस्करणे ( वामन०, ९५।७९ ग ) 'वृद्धवाक्यौषधान्येव' इति संशोधितः पाठ उपलभ्यते । ]

२४. द्र०-पार्जितर, पु० टै०, पृ० ७८ ।

२५. काशिराज्यास-पुराणविभागे संवादितेषु पञ्चमु कोशेषु । वामनपुराणस्य संवादितकोशानां विवरणं 'पुराणम्' भाग ३, अङ्क १, पृ० १३५-१३६ स्थले द्रष्टव्यम् ।

२६. पालिभाषायामपि 'फला', फलानि, इत्यादीनि द्विविधानि रूपाणि प्रथमा द्वितीययोर्बहुवचने भवन्ति ; वेदेऽप्येवम्, यथा 'विष्ठा', 'विष्टानि', 'या', 'यानि' इत्यादीनि रूपाणि—इति पूर्वमेवोक्तम् । अतोऽत्र 'औषधा', इत्यादीनि रूपाणि त्रयं ( वैदिक ) प्रयोगाः—इत्यपि वक्तुं शक्यते ।

येहि संस्थाप्यते क्षत्रमैडैक्ष्वाकुकुलं शुभम् । ( मत्स्य०, कोशे )<sup>२७</sup>

[ अत्र 'येहि' ( सं० 'येभिः' ) इति तृतीयाबहुवचने प्राकृतरूपम् । वेदे इव पालिभाषायां प्राकृते च अकारान्तशब्दस्य तृतीयाबहुवचने भिसन्तं रूपं दृश्यते । लौकिकसंस्कृते तु 'ऐस्'अन्तमेव—इति तु पूर्वमेवोक्तम् । अस्य पाठस्य स्थाने मत्स्यपुराणस्य आनन्दाश्रमसंस्करणे ( ५०।७४ घ ) 'येषु संस्था-  
स्यते तच्च ऐडैक्ष्वाकुकुलं शुभम्' इति पाठ उपलभ्यते । ]

विन्ध्यकानां कुलानान्ते नृपा वैवाहिकास्त्रयः । ( ब्रह्माण्ड०, ३।७।१८६ पृ )

[ अत्र 'कुलान+अन्ते' इति विच्छेदो युक्तः । 'कुलान' इति 'कुल' शब्दस्य प्राकृते पष्ठी बहुवचनम् ।<sup>२८</sup> यद्यपि ब्रह्माण्डपुराणस्य वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणे सम्पादकैः 'विन्ध्यकानां कुलानां ते नृपा वैवाहिकास्त्रयः' इति संशोधितः पाठो दृश्यते । परन्तु वायुपुराणेऽत्र 'विन्ध्यकानां कुलेऽतीते नृपा वै वाहिकास्त्रयः' इति पाठो वर्तते । अतो ब्रह्माण्डेऽपि 'कुलानान्ते' ( कुलान+अन्ते ) तथा 'वै वाहिकाः' (=वाहिकाः) इति पाठ एव भवितुमर्हति । ]

(आ) लिङ्गव्यत्ययः

ये चान्ये म्लेच्छजातयः ( वायु०, १६।२६७ ? ; वेंकटे०, २।३७।६६५ ख )

[ अत्र 'जातयः' इत्यस्य विशेषणत्वेन 'याश्चान्या' इति शुद्धः पाठो युक्तः । वायुपुराणस्यैके कोशेऽपि<sup>२९</sup> 'याश्चान्या' इति संशोधितः पाठो वर्तते । मत्स्यपुराणस्य आनन्दाश्रमसंस्करणेऽपि 'ये चान्ये म्लेच्छसंभवाः' ( ५०।७६ घ ) इति संशोधितः पाठो विद्यते ।

पुण्यस्य पुण्यतां कुर्वन् पञ्चस्रोताः सरस्वती । ( पञ्च०, ५।१८।१३६ पृ )

[ अत्र 'सरस्वती' इत्यस्य विशेषणत्वेन ( विधेयत्वेन ) कुर्वन् इति 'शतृ' प्रत्ययान्तं पुल्लिङ्गरूपं सर्वथाऽसाधु । अस्य स्थाने 'कुर्वती' इत्येव प्रयोगः

२७. मत्स्यपुराणस्य इंडिया-आफिस-पुस्तकालये E. 3535 संख्याके कोशे ।  
द्र०—पार्जितर, पु० टै०, पृ० २, टि० १६ ।

२८. द्र०—पार्जितर, पु० टै०, पृ० ७९ ।

२९. पार्जितर-cVñ (Jones Ms., W 6b, T. 38); द्र०—पार्जितर, पु० टै०, पृ० ३, टि० ३७ ।

साधुः स्यात् । परन्त्वनेन प्रयोगेण छन्दोभङ्गो जायेत । अतः छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव 'कुर्वत्' इति पाठोऽत्र प्रयुक्तः । ]

#### ४. तिङन्तपदसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) लङि 'अट्', 'आट्' आगमयोरभावः

कुमारं जनयद् निभुः ( मत्स्य०, १०।४४ छ, कोशेष्वपि )

दाशेयी जनयत् सुतम् ( तत्रैव, ५०।४९घ, कोशेष्वपि )

पुत्राणां जनयच्छतम् ( तत्रैव, १०।४७घ, कोशेष्वपि )

[ अत्र त्रिष्वपि स्थलेषु छन्दोदोषपरिहाराय 'अजनयत्' इति पाठस्य स्थाने 'जनयत्' इति पाठो वर्तते । शारदाकोशे तदनुसारिणि देवनागरीकोशे च 'पुत्रानजनयच्छतम्' इति संशोधितः पाठो वर्तते । ]

पूर्वं या मालिनी भवत् । ( मत्स्य०, ... ) ?

[ अत्र स्वरविवृत्तिपरिहाराय छन्दोदोषनिवारणाय च 'मालिनी अभवत्' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'मालिनी भवत्' इति पाठो वर्तते । 1० कोशे तु 'मालिनी अभूत्' इति पाठो विद्यते, 1० कोशे च 'मालिनी भूवत्' इति स्वरविवृत्तिरहितः पाठो वर्तते । ]

स्तोत्रमुदीरयत् ( वामनपुराणस्य प्रायः सर्वेषु कोशेषु )

[ अत्र 'आट्' आगमस्याभावः । वैकटेश्वरसंस्करणे ( ८५।३१घ ) 'आट्' आगमयुतः 'स्तोत्रमुदीरयत्' इति संशोधितः पाठो दृश्यते । अयम् आङ्गामयुतः पाठोऽपि छन्दोदोषरहित एव । परन्तु वामनपुराणस्य प्रायः सर्वेष्वेव कोशेषु ( शारदाकोशेऽपि ) छन्दोदोषप्रसङ्गमन्तरेणापि 'उदीरयत्' इत्येव पाठः प्राप्यते । अत एवायमेव प्राचीनः पाठः । ]

(आ) आत्मनेपदस्य स्थाने परस्मैपदम्

(१) कर्तृवाच्ये—

ते धुन्धुवाक्यं तु निशम्य दैत्याः

प्रोचुर्ननो विद्यति लोकपालः । ( वामन०, ७८।२० पू० )

[ अत्र 'इन्द्रवज्रा' वृत्तस्य प्रथमौ द्वौ पादौ 'स्यादिन्द्रवज्रा यदि तौ जगौ गः' इति लक्षणानुसारेण वृत्तस्यास्य सप्तमम् अक्षरं ( जगणस्य प्रथमम् अक्षरं ) लघु भवति । अतएवात्र छन्दोऽनुरोधेन 'विद्यते' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'विद्यति' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठः सप्तमाक्षरस्य लघुत्वकरणाय समाश्रितः । ]

(२) कर्मवाच्ये—

या च सदा द्विवि सेव्यति देवैर्

या च सदा भुवि सेव्यति विभैः ।

( मत्स्य० कोशेषु )

[ आनन्दाश्रममुद्रितमत्स्यपुराणस्य ११६।२२७ स्थाने S<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>2</sub>, D<sub>3</sub>, कोशेष्वयं पाठ उपलभ्यते । अत्र एकादशाक्षरात्मकौ दोषकवृत्तपादौ । दोषकवृत्तस्य च वृत्तरत्नाकरे—'दोषकवृत्तमिदं भमभाद् गौ' इति लक्षणम् । दोषकवृत्तस्य पादे नवमम् अक्षरं लघु भवति भगणस्य तृतीयाक्षरत्वात् । अतः, छन्दोऽनुरोधाद् अत्र दोषकवृत्तस्योभयोरपि पादयोः 'सेव्यते' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने कर्मवाच्येऽपि 'सेव्यति' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठो वर्तते, नवमाक्षरस्य लघुत्वकरणाय । ]

चिह्नं भवत्रतानां दृश्यति चेह जन्मनि प्रकटम् । ( मत्स्य०, १९३।३९७ )

[ अत्र 'आर्या' छन्दसः तृतीयचतुर्थपादौ । आर्यायास् तृतीये पादे द्वादश मात्रा भवन्ति । चतुर्थपादे च पञ्चदशमात्राः । इदं लक्षणमनुसृत्यात्र चतुर्थे पादे 'दृश्यते' इति शुद्धपाठस्य स्थाने कर्मण्यपि 'दृश्यति' इति पाठः प्रयुक्तः । ]

५. 'क्त्वा'ऽन्तसम्बन्धिनोऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगाः

(अ) समासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशाभावः

[ 'समासेऽनन्पूर्वे क्त्वो ल्यप्' ( पा० ७।१।३७ ) इति सूत्रे भगवता पाणिनिना भाषायाम् ( लौकिकसंस्कृते ) उपसर्गपूर्वकाद् घातोः 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य नित्यं 'ल्यप्'(य) आदेशो विहितः । परन्तु पुराणेषु क्वचिद् उपसर्गपूर्वकाद् घातोरपि 'ल्यप्' स्थाने 'क्त्वा' एव दृश्यते । तत्र प्रायेण छन्दोऽनुरोध एव हेतुर्

भवितुमर्हति । प्राकृतप्रभावोऽपि तत्र हेतुरनुमीयते, पालिप्राकृते तादृशानां प्रयोगानां सद्भावात् । अथवा, वैदिकप्रयोगप्रतिरूपकास् तादृशाः प्रयोगाः पुराणेषु वर्तन्ते—इत्यपि वक्तुं सुकरम् । तथापि, पुराणेषु विद्यमाना ल्यवादेश-रहिता एते प्रयोगा अपाणिनीया एव, यतः पाणिनिना छन्दस्येव समासेऽपि क्त्वो बाहुल्येन ल्यवादेशाभाव उक्तः, न तु भाषायामिति पूर्वमेव प्रस्तावनायां स्पष्टीकृतम् । ]

### उदाहरणानि

- (१) प्रवर्त्तयित्वा तं सर्वमृषिं वाजसनेयकम् ।  
 ( मत्स्य०, ५०।६४ पू, वायु०, ६६।१०० )  
 (२) प्रोक्त्वेत्थं वचनं विभो । ( वामन०, ६३।७ )  
प्रोक्त्वेत्थं च सरस्वती ( वामन०, ८६।६४ )  
 ऊं नमः शंकरायेति प्रोक्त्वा जग्मुर्हिमालयम् । ( वामन०, ५।१२ पू )  
 (३) शशिप्रभं देववरं त्रिनेत्रं संपूजयित्वा सहितं मृद्वान्या ।  
 ( वामन०, ८४।४१ )  
 (४) वामन्त्रयित्वा यो मोहादन्यं चा०... । ( कूर्म०, २।२२।८ )  
 (५) सर्वं बलं प्रेषयित्वा गङ्गातीरेऽग्निमाविशत् । ( ब्रह्म०, १३८।५ पु )  
 (६) उत्सादयित्वा क्षत्रं तु क्षत्रमन्यत्करिष्यति । ( वायु०, ६६।३८० )

[ वायुपुराणे अत्रैव प्रकरणेऽन्यत्र ( ९९।३७७ ) 'उत्साद्य पार्थिवान् सर्वान्' इत्यत्र 'उत्साद्य' इति साधुः पाठ एव दत्तः, न तु 'उत्सादयित्वा' इत्यपाणिनीयः पाठः, तत्र छन्दोदोषप्रसङ्गाभावात् । 'उत्सादयित्वा' इति पाठे प्राकृत-प्रभावोऽपि लक्ष्यते । अत एव वायुपुराणस्यैके कोशे ( पार्जितर—८Vii ) अस्य स्थाने 'उत्सादयित्वा' इति प्राकृतरूपमेव लिखितमुपलभ्यते ।<sup>३०</sup> विष्णुपुराणेऽत्रैव 'उत्साद्याखिलक्षत्रजातिम्' इति शुद्धः पाठ एव वर्तते ( ४।२४।६३ ) । ]

(आ) असमासेऽपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशः

[ लौकिकसंस्कृते 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यप्' आदेशस्तु अनव्यूषे समासे

३०. द्र०—पार्जितर, पु० टै ०, पु० ५३, द्वि० ५२ । (eVii = Jones MS.; W 6 b, T 38.)



( उपसर्गपूर्वकाद् धातोः ) एव भवति । परन्तु पुराणेषु प्राय उपसर्गरहिताद् धातोरपि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य ल्यबदेशो दृश्यते । अत्रापि छन्दोऽनुरोध एव मुख्यो हेतुः । प्राकृतप्रभावो वैदिकप्रयोगानुसरणं वाऽपि हेत्वन्तरम् अनुमातुं शक्यते परं तत्तु गौणमेव ।

### उदाहरणानि

( १ ) ततः शुक्लाम्बरैः शूर्पं वेष्ट्य संपूजयेत्फलैः । ( मत्स्य०, ८१।१८ पू )

„ „ „ वेष्टयित्वा चयेत्फलैः । ( D<sub>1</sub>, D<sub>13</sub> )

( २ ) तदोकारमर्थं गृह्य प्रतोदं\*\*\* । ( मत्स्य०, १३३।७ ; कोशेषु च )

तत्रोकारं च संगृह्य प्रतोदं\*\*\* । ( § — शारदालिपिकोशे )

( ३ ) शिरसा तु ततो वन्य मातरं\*\*\* । ( मत्स्य०, १५८।१० पू, कोशेषु च )

( ४ ) पूज्य देवं चतुर्मुखः । ( वामन०, ४६।३७ )

पूजयित्वा सरस्वतीम् । ( तत्रैव, ४०।४ )

संपूज्य देववेशं । ( तत्रैव, ६३।७६ )

( ५ ) तत्रोष्य सुचिरं कालं ( वामन०, ७६।८६ )

उपोष्य ... .. ( तत्रैव, ८०।३५ )

उषित्वा ... .. ( मत्स्य०, १८६।३३ )

( ६ ) सेव्य पांशुं प्रयत्नेन ( वामन०, ४५।२२ )

( ७ ) तत्र स्थाप्य हरिर्देवी ( वामन०, ५४।२८ )

[एषु उदाहरणेषु 'वेष्ट्य', 'गृह्य', 'वन्य', 'पूज्य', 'उष्य', 'सेव्य' 'स्थाप्य' इति पदानि छन्दोऽनुरोधादेव प्रयुक्तानि । यत्र तु छन्दोभङ्गभीतिर् न विद्यते तत्र 'पूजयित्वा', 'संपूज्य', 'उपोष्य', 'उषित्वा' इत्यादीनि पदान्येव प्रयुक्तानि । 'वेष्ट्य' 'गृह्य' इत्यत्र च कोशेषु 'वेष्टयित्वा', 'संगृह्य' इति संशोधनमपि विद्यते । ]

( ८ ) संतोष्य नारायणमर्च्य भक्त्या ( वामन, ७६।५ )

तमर्चयित्वा विश्वेशं ( तत्रैव, ८४।३६ )

[ पूर्ववद् अत्रापि 'अर्च्य' इत्यपाणिनीयः प्रयोगश् छन्दोऽनुरोध एव । यत्र च तादृश्यपेक्षा न विद्यते तत्र 'अर्चयित्वा' इति साधुरेव प्रयोगो वर्तते । पुनश्च, वामनपुराणस्य वैकटेश्वरसंस्करणे ८४।३३ श्लोके 'तमर्च्य' इति संगोप्यः प्रयोगो वर्तते, परन्तु सर्वेषु कोशेष्वत्र 'तमर्च्य' इत्येव पाठो वर्तते । अतो जगदने मूलपाठस्तु 'अर्च्य' इत्येवासीत्, वैकटेश्वरसम्पादकैश्च तस्य 'आर्च्य' इति निराधारमेव संशोधनं कृतम् । ]

पुराणेषु प्रयुक्तानाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगानाम् एतावता विमर्शेन व्यष्टिभिः प्रतीयते यद् एतादृशानां प्रयोगानां सद्भावे तु छन्दोऽनुरोध एव प्रधानो हेतुः ; पुराणेषु प्रायः पद्यभागेष्वेव अपाणिनीयप्रयोगा वर्तन्ते, गद्यभागेषु तु तेषां स्थाने पाणिनीयप्रयोगा एव प्रयुक्ताः, यथा 'उत्सादयित्वा क्षत्रं तु' (वायुः, ३।३८०) इति पद्ये प्रयुक्तस्य 'उत्सादयित्वा' पदस्य स्थाने 'उत्साद्याखिलक्षत्रजातिम्' (विष्णुः ४।२४।६३) इति गद्यांशे 'उत्साद्य' इति पाणिनीयः प्रयोग एव वर्तते । केषुचन प्रयोगेषु च प्राकृतभाषायाः प्रभावोऽपि स्पष्ट एव । बहूनाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगानां संशोधने च लिपिकारैः संपादकैश्च यः प्रयत्नः कृतः, तन्नेतरेण प्रयोगानाम् आर्षत्वं बाधितं भवति ; यतः, असाधूनामेव प्रयोगानां संशोधनं क्रियते, न त्वार्षाणाम् । अतः संशोधकानां विचारेष्वपि तेऽपाणिनीयप्रयोगा असाधव एवासन् न त्वार्षाः ।

# THE SĀṆKHYIZATION OF THE EMANATION DOCTRINE SHOWN IN A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF TEXTS\*

By

P. HACKER

[ महाभारत-शान्तिपर्वणः (C. E.) २२४ अध्याये, मनुस्मृतेः प्रथमेऽध्याये, पुराणेषु च भूतसृष्टिप्रक्रियायाः समानं वर्णनमुपलभ्यते । सर्गप्रतिसर्गात्मिकाः पुराणांशाः किरफलमहोदयेन स्वस्मिन् 'पुराण-पञ्चलक्षण' नामके ग्रन्थे त्रिषु विभागेषु विभाजिताः, यथा—TG I ( प्रथमो ग्रन्थसमूहः—ब्रह्म०, हरिवंश०, शिव०-धर्मसंहिता, अग्नि-पुराणं च ), TG II A/B ( द्वितीयो ग्रन्थसमूहः—गरुड०, पद्म०, वाराह०, विष्णु०, मार्कण्डेय०, कूर्म०, ब्रह्माण्ड०, लिङ्ग०, वायुपुराणं च ), TG III ( मत्स्यपुराणम् ) च । प्रस्तुतलेखस्य विदुषा लेखकेन श्री 'पॉल हैकर' महोदयेन मनुस्मृतेः सृष्टिप्रक्रियायाः, TG I पुराणानां च सृष्टिप्रक्रियायास् तुलनात्मकं विवेचनं कस्मिंश्चित् पूर्वलेखे कृतम् । अस्मिन् लेखे च तेन महाभा०-शान्तिपर्व (C. E.)-२२४ अध्यायस्य ११-३८ श्लोकेषु, TG II पुराणेषु च प्रोक्ताया भूतसृष्टि-प्रक्रियायाः पाठसमीक्षापूर्वकं विश्लेषणात्मकं गम्भीरं विवेचनं प्रस्तुतम् । अत्र च मनुस्मृत्युक्तसृष्टिप्रक्रियाया च तुलनाऽपि यथास्थानं क्रियते ।

अस्य लेखस्य प्रथमे भागे शान्तिपर्व (C. E.), अ० २२४, श्लोकाः ११-३८ समालोचिताः सन्ति । एषु श्लोकेषु १२-३१पू ( पूर्वार्धे ) श्लोकाः कालविभागं युगधर्माश्चोपवर्णयन्ति, शेषाश्च ११, ३१उ ( उत्तरार्ध )—३८ श्लोकाः पूर्वा सृष्टि ( = भूतसृष्टि ) वर्णयन्ति । एषामपि श्लोकानां मध्ये ३२-३४ श्लोकाः प्रक्षिप्ताः । ततश्च, ११, ३१ उ, ३५-३८ श्लोकेषु ब्रह्माख्याद् अव्यक्ताद् अक्षराद् भूततत्त्वाद् व्यक्ताव्यक्तात्मकस्य ( म० स्मृ०—सदसदात्मकस्य ) महद्भूताख्यस्य मनसः सृष्टिः, ततश्च क्रमाद् आकाशादीनां भूतानां स्वाभाविकी सृष्टिर् वार्यते । इदं वर्णनं च सांख्यसिद्धान्तमनुसरति । भूतानां चैवं सृष्टिः स्वाभाविकी त्वत् एष प्रवर्तते, न त्वीश्वरकृता पौख्येया वा—इत्यत्र शान्तिपर्वविवेचने मन्यते । तथाप्यत्र TG I पुराणेषु प्रतिपादितस्य सृष्टेर् ईश्वरकर्तृत्व-सिद्धान्तस्य प्रभावोऽप्युपलभ्यते; यतः, एषु शान्तिपर्वश्लोकेषु चत्वार

\* Reprinted from the WZKSO (Journal of the Indological Institute, University of Vienna), Band V, 1961, by kind permission.—Ed.

उपक्रमाः संयोज्यन्ते, येषु मध्ये द्वावुपक्रमौ (११, ३२ श्लोकयोः), अपौरुषेयसृष्टिविषयकौ, द्वौ च (३१ पू, ३३-३४) सृष्टेर ईश्वरकसृकत्व-प्रख्यापकौ स्तः । एवम्, शान्तिपर्वणोऽस्मिन्नंशे द्वयोर्विचारधारयो-रेकत्र सम्मेलनं वर्तते ।

लेखस्य द्वितीये भागे TG II पुराणानां भूतेन्द्रियसृष्टिवर्णनं विमृश्यते । तत्र TG II समूहस्य प्रथमे परिच्छेदे सांख्यानसारिण्येव सृष्टिप्रक्रियोपवर्णयते । TG I विभागस्य सप्त ( मार्कण्डेय, वायु, ब्रह्माण्ड, कूर्म, लिङ्ग, पद्म, विष्णु) पुराणानि द्वयोः प्रधानविभागयो-र्विभक्तव्यानि—(१) मार्कण्डेयं, (२) वायु-ब्रह्माण्डं च । (पद्मपुराणं विष्णुपुराणं च प्रायेण मार्कण्डेयमेवानुसरतः; कूर्मपुराणं लिङ्ग-पुराणं च वायु-ब्रह्माण्डमनुसरतः) । एषु सप्तसु पुराणेषु भूतसृष्टिप्रक्रियाया वर्णनं प्रायेण समानमेव, परन्तु तत्र षट् भिन्ना उपक्रमाः ( वायु-ब्रह्माण्डे, कूर्मे, लिङ्गे, मार्कण्डेये, पद्मे, विष्णौ च ) वर्तन्ते, न च ते प्रधानवर्णनेन सह संबदन्ति, तेषां सृष्टेरीश्वरकसृकत्वप्रतिपादकत्वात् । अतः, एते सर्वे एवोपक्रमाः पश्चात् प्रक्षिप्ता इति विदुषो लेखकस्य मतम् । अस्मिन् TG II-पुराणानां वर्णने शान्तिपर्ववर्णनस्य प्रभावोऽपि स्पष्टः प्रतीयते । ]

The following abbreviations are used in this paper

- Bd = *Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa* (Venkateśvara Press).  
 CE = Critical Edition (of Mbh).  
 JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society.  
 Kū = *Kūrmapurāṇa* (Bibliotheca Indica and Venkateśvara Press, samvat 1983).  
 L = *Lingapurāṇa* (Calcutta, sakābdi 1812 and 1885 A. D.).  
 M = *Manusmṛiti*, Chapter I (Nirṇayasāgara edition with Kullūka's commentary).  
 Mbh = *Mahābhārata* (quotations according to CE).  
 Mr = *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* (Bibliotheca Indica and Venkateśvara Press, samvat 1967).  
 Pd = *Padmapurāṇa* (Ānandāśrama Edition).  
 PP = W. Kurfel, *Das Purāṇa Pāṇḍalākṣaṇa*, Bonn, 1927 (References are to pages and verse-numbers, e. g. PP. 6, 42, means verse 42 occurring on page 6 of the Purāṇa texts in Kurfel's edition).  
 Śp = Śāntiparvan of Mbh (quotations according to CE).  
 TG = Text Group (Textgruppe) of the Sarga-Pratisarga texts in PP.  
 Vā = *Vāyupurāṇa* (Ānandāśrama Edition and Venkateśvara Press, 1933 A. D.).  
 Vī = *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (Calcutta, 1884 and Gorakhpur [Gita Press], samvat 2009).

Adhyāya 224 of Śp and some passages of M were thoroughly scrutinized from the point of view of the historian of philosophy by Erich Frauwallner as early as 1925, in an article in JAOS, vol. 45, pp. 51—67. A remarkable result of these investigations,

which was later incorporated in Frauwallner's *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (vol. I, Salzburg, 1953, pp. 97ff.), is the discovery that there are pre-Sāṅkhyic texts in Śp. This result has greatly enhanced the importance of the Great Epic as a source, or as the reflection of sources, providing materials for the knowledge of the history of philosophy. The opposition of "philosophy of syncretism or of transition" (Mischphilosophie or Übergangsphilosophie), which had dominated the discussion about the nature of "the Philosophy of the Epic" among scholars of an earlier generation<sup>1</sup>, has been replaced by fresh points of view, and it is no longer justified now to speak of the philosophy of Mbh as of a body of doctrines exhibiting anything like intrinsic unity. The didactic pieces of the epic reflect several currents of thought belonging to different periods of time, from which no other documents are available, and to some extent developments can be traced within the texts themselves.

In the meantime, however, the Critical Edition of the relevant Mbh passages (*Śāntiparvan*, fasc. 22 and 23, Poona, 1951—1952) and W. Kirfel's *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (Bonn, 1927) have appeared. This makes a fresh study of the subject desirable. It may be stated beforehand that this investigation will not cancel Frauwallner's results, but render their significance even more conspicuous by tracing the line of development farther in both directions, towards the past as well as towards later periods, and by analysing more elaborately some aspects of the texts treated by Frauwallner.

For the texts of Śp 224 and M are in a direct genetic line connected with those purāṇic texts the historical development of which, as far as it is traceable in the purāṇas themselves, has been shown by Kirfel in his *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*. In the direction of the past, there is a genetic connection to TG I, as I tried to show in a brief analysis of the cosmogony of the

---

1. Cp. Paul Deussen : *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam* (Leipzig, 1906), Preface, p. vi; Otto Strauß : *Indische Philosophie* (München, 1924) p. 126.

Manusmṛti in comparison with TG I a few years ago<sup>1</sup>. In the present article, it is proposed to trace the line of development to a later stage, viz. to TG IIA and TG IIB, after first attempting a fresh critical analysis of the Cosmogony Text of Śp 224, utilizing the Critical Edition<sup>2</sup>. The study is limited to the account of the elemental emanation as given in Śp 224 and the exposition of the emanation of the elements and senses as set forth in TG IIA/IIB, all matter after Śp 224, 38 and after PP 50, 45b (or PP 9, 20, respectively) being reserved for future investigations.

### I. The Account of Emanation of Śp 224

Śp 224, 11 (quoted below, p. 303) describes the nature of the primeval entity. Immediately afterwards, the subject changes. The following verses, 12—31 b, have no direct bearing on the contents of 11, treating as they do of Divisions of Time (12—21 and 28—30) and of the *Dharmas* of the *Yugas* (22—27). After 30, the subject of Cosmogony is resumed.

Up to Śp 224, 38 there are parallel passages in M :

12—21 correspond to M 64—70 (Divisions of Time);

22—27 correspond to M 81—86 (*Yugadharmāḥ*);

28—38 correspond to M 71—78 (conclusion of the tract on Divisions of Time and Cosmogony).

The different arrangement of the several subjects in Mbh and M already suggests that neither M nor Mbh has used the other text, but both have drawn upon a common source, nay, several sources, viz. a short text on Divisions of Time, another one on *Yugadharmāḥ*, and a third one on Cosmogony—and that the

---

2. *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*, in: *Jñānamuktīvali*, Commemoration Volume in Honour of Johannes Nobel (New Delhi, 1959), pp. 77ff. For lack of space, this article had to be very brief, and the comparison of M with Mbh 12, 231—232 could be given only in a very summary way. Besides, I eventually forgot, though I originally intended, to refer to Frauwallner's article in JAOS, vol. 45, a reference which would have been especially useful for the explanation of the verses M 16—19 (see pp. 80f. of my article in *Jñānamuktīvali* and pp. 57f. of Frauwallner's article in JAOS, vol. 45).

3. CE 12, 224, 11—12 is Bombay Edn. 12, 231, 11—12; CE 12, 224, 13 is B.E. 13—14; CE 12, 224, 14—31 is B.E. 15—32; CE 12, 224, 32—38 is B.E. 12, 232, 1—7.

redactors of Śp and M have pieced them together in different ways. The observation of two interruptions in the course of exposition raises this supposition almost to certainty : (1) The verse Śp 224, 11, which gives a description of the primeval being or the primeval state of the world, is evidently meant as an introduction to the narration of the cosmogonic process, but the subject is resumed only with 31 ; (2) the tract on Divisions of Time is cut short with 21, but abruptly resumed in 28, an interruption which is absent in M. These breaks in the continuity of the narration as well as the difference of arrangement in Mbh and in M are incompatible with the assumption that the text had from the outset formed a coherent whole. In placing the introductory verse of the cosmogonic narration (11) at the beginning of the whole passage, i. e. by indicating the third subject before treating the first and second ones, the redactor of Śp 224 evidently meant to bind together more closely the three subjects which he wanted to connect into a whole, and to do this by using the very words of his sources, without adding links of his own invention.

The sources used by the redactor were small tracts which had had an independent existence and had presumably been used for purposes of instruction even before they were incorporated into the epic. Such tracts can be traced in other texts of the anonymous Sanskrit literature also. We will call them Short Instructional Tracts (German: Kleine Lehrstücke) or simply Short Tracts. One text of this kind is e. g. preserved, with enlargements, in TG I (see my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*); another one is the account of Viṣṇu's *prādurbhāvas* in Mbh 3, 272 (see my book *Prāhlāda* [Mainz, 1959], p. 25—26 with footnote on p. 26 ; a third instance—the Sāṅkhya Text of TG IIA/IIB—will be dealt with in section II of this article.

Thus we may say that three Short Tracts—on Divisions of Time, on *Yuyudharmāḥ*, and on Cosmogony—are united in Śp 224. In this article we will consider only the text Emanation of the Elements, on what is called *pūrvā sṛṣṭiḥ* in Śp 224, 38d, leaving over for future treatment other texts of Śp 224.

Textual criticism affords some precious data regarding the history of the initial verses of this Short Tract. These verses, including Śp 224, 11, run as follows :

11. *anādy-antum ajam divyam ajaram dhruvam avyayam  
apratarkyam avijñeyam brahmāgre samavartata.*  
(v. l. : *saṃpravartate*)
31. *pratibuddho vikurute brahmākṣayam kṣapā-kṣaye  
sṛjate ca mahad bhūtam tasmād vyaktātmanam manah.*  
(v. l. *vyaktavyaktātmanam manah*).
32. *brahma tejomayam sukram yasya sarvam idaṃ jagat*  
(v. l. : *rasaḥ*)  
*ekasya bhūtam bhūtasya dvayam sthāvara-jāṅgamam*
33. *aḥar-mukhe vibuddhaḥ saṃ sṛjate vidyaya jagat  
agra eva mahābhūtam āśu vyaktātmanam manah.*
34. *abhibhūyēha cārcaṣmad vyaśṛjat sapta mānasān  
dāragam bahudhāgāmi prārthanā-saṃśayātmanam.*  
(Variant readings have been noted, here as elsewhere,  
only if they are of importance for the discussions of  
this article).

33-34 are lacking in one manuscript (of the Devanāgarī Composite Version)<sup>3a</sup>, and in 3 southern manuscripts as well as in the Kumbhakonam edition the verses 35-38 (quoted below, p. 309) appear after 31 CE for the first time and are then repeated after 34 CE. Moreover the awakening of the Creator and the creation of the *manas* are mentioned twice (in 31 and 33). These facts safely indicate that in manuscripts or oral traditions different attempts had been made to commence the cosmogonic narration and that the initial verses of different traditions were more or less mechanically juxtaposed by the redactors of the Śp. text. One of these traditions made the account of cosmogony, after the introductory verse 11 and the intervening tracts, begin with 31; this must have been the oldest way of beginning the account after it had been combined

3a. One MS of the Northern recension (Kāśmīrī version) omits 32c-33b, but this seems to be a case of haplography due to the fact that both 32b and 33b end with *jagat* in that MS.



with the two preceding tracts, since 31 occurs in all manuscripts. The 3 southern manuscripts and the Kumbhakonam edition testify to that old tradition in which 32-34 were lacking, but the compiler of that version knew also the younger tradition which included those verses, and in order to do justice to both, he mechanically juxtaposed their readings, first omitting 32-34, but then, after 38, giving the whole account once again, with the inclusion of 32-34. The one manuscript of the Devanāgarī Composite Version, however, which omits 33-34, seems to point to a tradition in which 32 had already been inserted, while 33-34 were still lacking. The text of the majority of the manuscripts, however, juxtaposes four different beginnings of the account: one is 11, a verse which is here used as an introduction to the whole tract in which three Short Texts (on Divisions of Time, on *Yugadharmāḥ*, and on Cosmogony) are united; the second one is 31 a—b, a half verse which tries to connect the preceding tract on Divisions of Time with the following on Cosmogony; the third one is 32; the fourth one is 33 (—34).

This practice of juxtaposition, which is a primitive method of redaction, caused by the desire of doing equal justice to different traditions, is not traceable in the Cosmogony of Śp 224 only, but can be observed in other texts of the epics and purāṇas also. In the Rāmāyaṇa, e.g., one and the same subject is sometimes treated several times in slightly different ways in successive sargas. Another instance is the initial part of PP, TGI, in which at least two different beginnings, PP 2, 3 and 3, 10, can be distinguished (cp. my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*). In the beginnings of short texts that had originally had an independent existence, this practice has sometimes led to a state which may at first sight be figuratively and approximately depicted as frayed. There are, as it were, various loose threads at the fore-edge of the fabric of the text. The textual condition which we have described as juxtaposition of different traditions, may of course as well be characterized as interpolation or addition of parts of later versions or traditions to the original,

i.e., to use the figurative expression: not all of the loose threads originally belonged to the tissue. The critic has to examine which one of them has a continuous connexion with the tissue and which have been secondarily attached to it. Thus it will be our task to analyse in detail the four different beginnings of the Short Tract on Cosmogony contained in Śp 224.

We have also to bear in mind that in the case of ancient Short Tracts the affixing of additional beginnings may be due to the intention of modernizing the texts. Thus in TG I the insertion of the verse PP 2, 3 was evidently caused by the desire of adapting the ancient account to cosmogonic ideas of the Sāṅkhya system. It may even be stated as a law governing the transmission of instructional texts, that the bulk of an old Short Tract is handed down unaltered or with minor changes only, but the introduction to it is at times remodelled to adapt the whole text to later views or to a new context. This is sometimes, as in the case of the cosmogony of Śp 224, done by the insertion of additional initial verses (which perhaps belonged originally to other, later texts), sometimes by other means as we shall see in the case of TG IIA/IIB.

Let us now examine the first introductory verse (11) of the account of elemental emanation:

*anādy-antam ajam divyam ajaraṁ dhruvam avyayam*

(v. l.: *avyaktam ajaraṁ dhruvam*)

*apratarkeyam avijñeyam, brahmāyṛe samavartate*

(v. l.: *sampravartate*).

This verse conceives of the entity that existed before the origin of the constituents of the world, as an impersonal being, which is called *brahman* as in early upanishads. The attributes by which it is here characterized give no indication as to whether the *brahman* is a spiritual being or something like primary matter. Its most prominent quality is its permanence, which is described by no less than five adjectives *anādyanta*, *aja*, *ajara*, *dhruva*, *avyaya*). Besides, its supermundane nature (*divya*) and unknowability (*apratarkeya*, *avijñeya*) are mentioned.

A variant, attested by 11 manuscripts, replaces *avyayam* by *avyaktam* and changes the arrangement of the words for the sake of the metre. This alteration is of course due to the tendency, so often observable in the anonymous literature, of modernizing an ancient text by the introduction of ideas or terms that had become fashionable at a later time, and it makes the *brahman* similar to the primary matter which is denoted by the term *avyaktam* in Sāṅkhya.

An approximate parallel is found at M 5 :

*āsīd idam tamo-bhūtam aprajñātam alakṣyaṁ  
apratarkyam avijñeyam prasuptam iva sarvataḥ.*

In this verse the designation of the primeval entity or primeval state as *brahman* is eliminated, and the attribute *prasupta*, which originally, of course, referred to the personal Creator immersed in his cosmic sleep, is assigned to the pre-creational state of the *world*, whereas, on the other hand, the attribute *avyakta*, which originally denoted primary matter or the world in the state of dissolution, is in the following verse (M 6) assigned to the personal Creator—two interesting cases of exchange between impersonalism and personalism.—Two words of the Śp text, viz *apratarkyam* and *avijñeyam*, are confirmed by M 5.

The whole verse, Śp 224, 11, recurs, with significant variants, in Bḍ, Kū, L, Mr, and Vā (PP 46, 10), cp. below, pp. 317 ff. The imperfect tense *samavartata*<sup>4</sup> is seemingly confirmed by

4 The reading *samāvartata* (with *ā*) found in PP is an error, all Purāṇa editions I could consult having *samavartata*. By the way, it may be noted here that the sentence *brahmāgre saprasavartate* had a long history starting from one of the later hymns of the R̥gveda and extending at least to the time of the great Vedānta teacher Śaṅkara (7th–8th century A. D.). R̥gveda 10, 121, 1 begins with the words *Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ samavartatāgre*. Here the imperfect tense is used, and the subject of the verb is a personal being, not an impersonal entity. Whether *samavartata* means *began to move*, or *existed* or *arose*, is not quite clear. Śaṅkara (Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 1. 2. 23) took it in the latter sense (*samavartatāgre ajāyadity arthah*). The pāda Śp 224, 11 d was obviously modelled on the pattern of that R̥gveda sentence, but the verb was taken in the sense *begins to work*, which was rendered clearer by the addition of the second prefix *-pra-*; at the same time, the tense was changed into the present (to suggest the idea of cyclic recurrence) and what was the most important change, the subject of the verb was no longer

four of these purāṇa texts, but is certainly not original. For the whole of the following account, at least those of its verses which are incontestably original, are in the present tense. Therefore, *sampravartate*, which is attested by 11 manuscript texts and one marginal note, has to be preferred. Moreover, this form makes better sense. For *samavartata* may suggest the idea of origination, which, however, is excluded by the preceding attributes "without beginning or end" and "unborn." *sampravartate*, on the other hand, can more easily be understood to mean *begins to work*. The substitution of the imperfect for the present tense, in Śp as well as in the purāṇas, is easily explainable from the fact that the text treats of an event which, though imagined as cyclically recurring, is also conceived of as having happened in the past.

After the introductory verse 11 and after the intervening verses that treat of other subjects than cosmogony, the exposition of the process of emanation starts with 31 (quotation above). The verses 31—34 are in a curious state of confusion. We have already seen that there are strong grounds—manuscript testimony as well as repetitions in the contents—for rejecting 32—34 as unoriginal. We will consider these verses below. As for 31, I am inclined to regard its first half as an attempt to connect the account of emanation with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time and at the same time to mention a personal Creator; so this half verse did not possibly form part of the original Short Tract on Cosmogony either. The continuation of this tract, which began with 11, might fittingly have been the second half of 31 (*śrjate ca mahat bhutam* ...), and

---

the personal *Hiraṇyagarbha* but the impersonal *brahman*. The MSS of Śp and the purāṇas that changed *sampravartate* into *samavartata* did so probably under the influence of the old Rgveda verse. The subject of the verb, in PP 56, 10 remained the impersonal *brahman*. But afterwards, in the same purāṇic tract, the sentence once more occurs (PP 51, 58), and at that place the context makes it clear that here the personal *Brahmā*, not *brahma*, is meant: *adikaṣṭi ca bhutanāṃ Brahmadāre samavartata*, and under the influence of this passage, the redactor of Vā-Bḍ understood *Brahma* at PP 46, 10 also, cp. below, p. 322. So the history, extending over more than a thousand years, of the old ṛgvedic sentence reflects continual fluctuations between a personalistic and an impersonalistic conception of the Highest Being.

after this, 35 might have followed (*quotation below*, p. 309). I think there are strong reasons for the assumption that the beginning as well as the continuation of the account of emanation (11 and 31 c—d, respectively) must have been of an impersonalistic tendency. For the continuation of the emanation is an evolutionary process, in which every entity evolves from the preceding one more or less mechanically, without the intervention of a directing person; this suggests that the first stage also happened without the activity of a person. The idea of discharging or emitting out of one's self (*srjate*, 31 c) need not necessarily refer to the conception of a personal Creator. The *ātmanepada* is doubtless significant. It stresses the impersonal, mechanical character of the process, whereas in the originally theistic cosmogony of TG I the *parasmaipada* (*sasarja*, *asrjat*: PP 3, 10. 14; 4, 15. 18) is used to express real action of a person. The *ātmanepadas* of *vi-kr*, *vikurute* and *vikurvāṇa*, which occur in the sequel (cp. the quotation of 35—38 below, p. 309), suggest the same idea of a mechanical process. In 35, *manah śiṣṭim vikurute* does not mean that the Mind "differentiates" a "creation" already in existence, but the idea is that the Mind *differentiates itself*, i.e., *gets into a process of differentiation*, as the result of which the emanation (*śiṣṭi*) arises; so *śiṣṭim* is an effected, not an affected, object. On the other hand, in 31 the *ātmanepada* form *vikurute* is construed with an affected object (*akṣayyam*), and this difference from 35 in the use of the *ātmanepada* form *vikurute* also tells against the originality of the first half of 31. The *ātmanepada* participle *vikurvāṇa*, which occurs three times in 36—38, again expresses the idea of *differentiating oneself* or *falling into a process of differentiation*.—The notion of the "desire to create" (*śiṣṭkṛā*), which is attributed to the *Manus* in 35, implies partial personification only. It is certainly a reminiscence of the ancient theistic cosmogony of TG I, in which the Creator begins his work because he is "desirous to create" (*śiṣṭkṛu*, PP 3, 10). But this influence has not substantially altered the essentially mechanical character of the emanation process as described in Śp 224, for as the ether "is born" or

"arises" from the *manas*, so each of the following elements "arises" from the preceding one. If the process had in the original account started with an action of a personal Creator, one would expect that afterwards the Creator should personally create the products of creation or at least arrange for their being created, as he does in the purely theistic tract of TG I (cp. my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*). Moreover, as we have seen above (p. 306) in examining a verse of the Manusmṛiti, impersonalistic or mechanistic attributes were interchangeable with personalistic or theistic ones. It is the general tenor of an account of cosmogony that allows to determine it as theistic or impersonalistic, and this tenor is clearly impersonalistic in the case of the cosmogony of Śp 224 once the interpolations are eliminated. The original form of this Short Tract belongs to a current of thought different from that of which the tract of TG I is representative, but concordant with the thought of some impersonalistic texts of the early upaniṣads.

So there is some probability of the whole account of emanation having originally run approximately like this :

*anādy-antam ajam divyam ajaram dhruvam avyayam  
apratarkyam avijñeyam brahmāyre sampravṛtate* (11)  
*srjate ca mahad bhūtaṁ tasmād vyaktātmanakaṁ manaḥ* (31c—d).  
(v. 1.: *vyaktādyuktātmanakaṁ manaḥ*)

*manaḥ sṛṣṭiṁ vikurute codyamānam sivilkṣayā  
ākāśaṁ jāyate tasmāt tasya śabdo guṇo mataḥ* (35)  
*ākāśāt tu vikurvāṇāt sarva-gandha-raśaḥ śūciḥ  
balavān jāyate vāyus tasya sparśo guṇo mataḥ* (36)  
*vāyor api vikurvāṇāj jyotiḥ bhūtaṁ tamo-nulom  
rociṣṇi jāyate tatra tad rūpa-guṇam ucyate* (37)

*jyotiḥ 'pi vikurvāṇāt bhuvantyo āpo rasātmiṇāḥ  
adbhyaḥ gandha-guṇā bhūmiḥ pūrvāṣṭā sṛṣṭir ucyate* (38)

The whole account is in the present tense, probably because the process of cosmogony is imagined as repeating itself at the beginning of every aeon, not as happening once only. 35—38 almost literally agree with M 75—78.

In 31 d there is an important *varia lectio*, attested by 3 manuscripts, viz. *vyaktāvyaktātmakam manah* instead of *tasmād vyaktātmakam manah*. This reading would suggest that the *manas* is the *mahad bhūtam* and is not evolved from another entity called *mahad bhūtam*. The *manas* would thus be the first product of evolution, which would correspond to an earlier stage of development of the doctrine and also accord with the cosmogony of M 74—78. The epithet *vyaktāvyaktātmaka*, which is contained in the variant, means more or less the same as *sad-asad-ātmaka*, which characterizes the *manas* in M 74 :

*tasya so 'har-nisasyānte prasuptaḥ pratibudhyate  
pratibuddhaḥ ca sṛjati manah sad-asad-ātmakam*<sup>5</sup>.

I am inclined to regard the reading *vyaktāvyaktātmakam* as original. Later, the *manas* was certainly considered to belong to the evolved state of things, a view which is attested in our text by 33 : *āśu vyaktātmakam manah*. But at an earlier stage, it would not be so well intelligible why the *manas* should have been called *vyaktātmaka*, especially if it is probable that the text of 11 had not originally contained the word *avyaktam*. The attribute *vyaktāvyaktātmakam*—as well as *sad-asad-ātmakam* in M—, on the other hand, is easily explainable from the fact that the *manas* is intermediate between the inconceivable *brahman* and the products of creation, which are “made asunder” (i.e. rendered *vyakta*) by the *manas*.

In the remaining verses of the original Short Tract. 35—38 there are several variants, some of which, while at the same time concordant with M, are attested by numerous Mbh

5 This Manu verse is another attempt, besides those traceable in Śp 224, of giving a new introduction to the ancient Short Tract (which had once had an independent existence). It was obviously composed with the intention (1) of connecting the subsequent account of Cosmogony with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time, and (2) of replacing the original beginning, with the impersonal *brahman*, by a mention of a personal Creator. Its ideas point to an early period, when the Sāṅkhya had not yet become popular and *manas* still was the first product of cosmogony. The impersonalistic initial verse of the ancient Short Tract has been placed in M at the beginning of the first account of Cosmogony (M 5), but has been thoroughly modified, only one pāda having been retained from the ancient verse (cp. above, p. 306).

manuscripts, but none of them implies a notable change of ideas; it is therefore not necessary to discuss them here.

As for the philosophical contents of the verses, the reader is referred to Frauwallner's article in JAOS, 1925.

There is a second impersonalistic beginning in our text, viz. verse 32. The verse is difficult. As it stands it seems to mean :—

“*Brahman* is the fiery seed, the one being of which (*yasya... ekasya bhūtasya*) the whole of this world, consisting of immobile (inanimate) and mobile (animate) beings, is (or : has become) a double.”

But there is a remarkable variant, viz. *rasaḥ* (*rasam* in one MS) instead of *jagat*. This reading is attested by 14 manuscripts of the Northern and Southern recensions<sup>6</sup> and is evidently the *lectio difficilior*; so it deserves special notice. The verse recurs at Śp 232, 9 (Bombay edition : 240, 9)<sup>7</sup>, and the reading *rasaḥ* is attested by all manuscripts of that passage. The verse may have had a sort of independent existence, at least it must have been felt to be very impressive as it was quoted in various contexts—like other impressive verses, as e.g. PP (TG I), 2, 3a—b, which recurs at TG II B, PP 45, 7c—d, right side; and PP 3, 11, which recurs several times in the anonymous literature. Textual criticism has to find out the original context of such verses—which is a difficult task as long as we do not have word indexes or at least pāda or verse indexes to all works of the anonymous literature. As regards the verse in question, neither Śp 224 nor Śp 232 seems to be its original context. It may or may not originally have formed the initial verse of a cosmogonic account.—If in this verse *rasaḥ* is substituted for *jagat*, the meaning seems to be that “the universe (*sarvam idam*) is the essence of *brahman*”. But the idea of this sentence<sup>8</sup> is hard to understand. It would

6 5 of these MSS, 3 additional MSS, and the commentary of Vidyāsingara have *brahma-bhūtasya* instead of *bhūtam bhūtasya*, but this seems negligible.

7 The recurrence was not noticed by the editor of Śpm I.E., so he did not utilize it in establishing the text of 224, 32.

8 The idea is also suggested by the editors of the new edition of Apte's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, s. v. *rasa*, meaning 15.



amount to an excess of pantheism or even materialistic monism : the essence of the Absolute is the World. Anyhow, we have at least to reckon with the possibility that there was such a philosophy in ancient India, and to wait until other contexts afford further elucidation. The idea must have been unintelligible or offensive to an early redactor ; so he replaced *rasaḥ* by *jagat*<sup>9</sup>. It is tempting to translate *rasa* by *discharge* or *secretion*, a meaning which would be easily derivable from the original sense *juice* ; the passage would then mean that the universe was a discharge of the seed which is *brahman*, but I cannot vouch for the existence or possibility of this meaning.

So the verse would mean : "*Brahman* is the fiery seed of which the universe, inanimate and animate, is the essence (or : of which the universe is the discharge—?) ; (the universe) is a double of (that) one being."

In translating *dvayam* by "a double", I have in mind the meaning of *dvaita*, which, as long observation of many texts has taught me, rarely means *duality* or *dualism*, but mostly the *state of there being a second one (a double)*. This signification presupposes a noun which, if it has several meanings, must at least in one of them signify *a double, something which appears as a second one beside an original or essential unity*, and if there is such a noun it can only be *dvaya*.

Instead of taking *brahma tejomayam sukram* to be a nominal sentence (with *bhavati* to be supplied), it would also be possible, in the context of Śp 224, to construe *erjate* in the preceding half verse as a predicate of which *brahma*, with *tejomayam sukram* as an apposition, would be the subject : "*Brahman*, the fiery seed, creates (i. e. discharges out of its self) the Great Being, the *Manas*, which is evolved and unevolved..." But this construction would be secondary, as it is rendered possible only through the juxtaposition method of the Śp redactor.

9 Deussen's translation of the verse (*Vier philosophische Texte*.....; 240, 9c—10=CE 232, 9) offers no acceptable solution. He makes *brahma-tejomayam* a compound. reads *sukla* instead of *sukra*, and translates *yaya sarvam idaṃ rasaḥ* by *dessen Geschmack diesss Weltall an sich hat*, i. e., he takes *rasa* to mean something like *taste-bearer*, a meaning which does not seem to be attested anywhere,

If the cosmogonic account which is preserved in Śp 224, originally started from an impersonal Absolute, the personalistic, i. e. theistic conception which is represented by TG I (and the roots of which can also be traced to some texts of the brāhmapas and early upaniṣads) must have soon influenced the impersonalistic text. The influence began, as we have seen p. 308, by taking over the notion of *śiṣṭkṣā*. But then, several other attempts were made to introduce theism into the text by making the cosmogony start from a masculine being. One of them is represented by Śp 224, 31 a—b (a half verse with which 31 c—d, which probably belonged to the original, impersonalistic text, was combined into a sentence), a second one by 33 (with which 34c—d is to be connected), and a third one by M 74 (which is very similar to Śp 224, 31 ; see the quotation above, p. 310 with footnote). All the three beginnings include the idea that the Creator awakes from his cosmic sleep, and this idea at the same time establishes connexion with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time, which concludes with mentioning the cosmic day and night.

In 31 b, *brahmākṣayyam* is only understandable if it is dissolved into *brahmā akṣayyam* (for otherwise there would be no masculine noun to which *pratibuddho* would refer and which could be made the subject of *arjate*), and *akṣayyam* (the same word which was introduced by later versions into the verse of Śp 224. 11 as an attribute of *brahman* which is a sort of primary matter ; cp. below, p. 319). must mean something like primary matter, so that the sentence would mean : "Having awoken at the end of the night, *Brahmā* differentiates (makes asunder) the Imperishable."

In 33 it is once more stated that the Creator, having awoken, created the *Manas*, "the quick one, of evolved nature". The *manas* is here evidently identical with the *mahābhūtam*. So this verse testifies to the existence of the view of the *manas* as a *mahābhūtam* or *mahād bhūtam* (this reading is in 21 MSS of several versions, accordingly, if the same view, which is certainly ancient, was originally expressed by 31 also, the reading *tasmād vyaktīmatam manah* (which implies that the *mahād bhūtam* is the origin of, not identical with, the *manas*) has to be rejected in 31, and the only

alternative afforded by the manuscript material is *vyaktāvyaktāt-mākam*. 33 would thus agree with the original text of 31 in the view that the *manas* is the Great Being, the first product of creation, but differ from it in so far as the *manas* is described as evolved, no longer as evolved-and-unevolved.

The text of 33b is ambiguous in the word *vidyayā*, which may stand for *avidyayā*, according to sandhi rules. The commentaries quoted by the editor of CE all understand *avidyayā*, and this seems in fact to be the probable reading, though the editor of CE preferred *vidyayā*. *vidyayā*, in this context would mean something like *by a spell*, or the word would refer to the Creator's knowledge of the karman of the several beings, in accordance with which their new existence is shaped (cp. *prāṇināṃ karma-vipakāṃ viditvā* in the cosmogony of Praśasta-pāda's *Padāṁtadharmasamgraha*<sup>10</sup>). But I would prefer to read *avidyayā*, which is well in concord with texts of purāṇic Sāṅkhya as well as later Vedānta, cp., e.g. *the abuddhi-pūrvakaḥ*<sup>11</sup> *sargaḥ* of PP 20, l. So the idea is that the Creator utilized Nescience, a dull, gloomy, de-spiritualizing force, in creating the material world.

Verse 34 is puzzling. Its second half evidently gives a characterization of the *manas*, which was mentioned at the end of 33, describing it as "far-going, moving in manifold ways, consisting of desire and doubt"; this half verse seems to be a late accretion. But to this addition, a second interpolation was added by another redactor, who was induced by that harmonizing tendency which has been so effective in the history of purāṇic texts, to insert a reminiscence of the ancient cosmogony of TG I: Śp 224, 34b (*vyasṛjāt sapta mānasān*; v. l. *asṛjāt...*) is almost identical with PP 4, 16d (so *'sṛjāt sapta mānasān*). In accordance with the text of TG I, the subject of *vyasṛjāt* should be the Creator himself, so that 34a—b would mean: "Having here overpowered the Flaming One (i. e. the Great

10. The *abhidhyāna* or *cintana* practised by the Creator in the act of creation (two instances, out of many, are PP 20, 1 and M 8) is of course quite a different thing from *vidyā*.

11. In the parallel passage, PP 62, 26, the reading should also be *abuddhi-*, not *buddhi-*.

Being, the *manas*), he created seven *Mānasas*." It is interesting that the *manas* is conceived of as a bright substance. The overpowering of this substance is probably to be understood to mean that the Creator forced the *manas* to discharge the *Mānasas* as its offspring. The whole idea is entirely foreign to the rest of the cosmogonic account of Śp 224, nay, it is understandable only if the parallel of PP 4, 16 (to which parallels from M can be added) is utilized for explanation.

To recapitulate, we may state that the cosmogony of Śp 224 has four juxtaposed introductions, two of which are mechanistic (11 and 32), the two others being theistic (31a—b and 33, to which 34c—d and 34a—b are two successive additions).

The first mechanistic introduction, verse 11, is most probably the original one. It describes the premundane states as the *brahman*, which is "without beginning or end, unborn, supermundane, undecaying, stable, imperishable, inconceivable, unknowable", and which "starts moving in the beginning".

The second mechanistic introduction (32) also speaks of the *brahman*, but it is here conceived of as "a fiery seed, of which the universe is the essence (or: the discharge—?); the one being of which the world, animate and inanimate, is a double."

The first theistic introduction (31a—b) calls the Creator *Brahmā* and says that, "having awoken at the end of the (cosmic) night, he differentiates the Imperishable", by which word primary matter is signified here.

The second theistic introduction (33—34) says that (the Creator), "having awoken at the beginning of the (cosmic) day, creates the world through Nescience: first (he creates) the Great Being, the quick *Manas*, which is of an evolved nature, which is far-going, moves in manifold ways, and consists of desire and doubt; then having here overpowered the flaming (being), he created the seven *Mānasas*."

The one account of emanation of Śp 224 thus reflects, as a result of the juxtaposition method of the compiler, two different currents of thought and various stages of development of cosmogonic ideas.

## II. The Emanation of the Elements and Senses according to TG II<sup>12</sup>

We will deal here with the 1st Chapter of TG IIA (PP 6ff.) and the 1st Chapter of TG IIB (PP 44ff.). The nucleus of the 1st Chapter of TG II is a cosmogony on Sāṅkhya lines. But it has been enlarged by numerous additions and interpolations; further, in a few cases original verses or lines have been dropped, and there have been a great deal of alterations in the several versions. The texts of the 7 purāṇas which form the basis of TG II, may be divided into 3, and ultimately 2, main groups :

1. Mr 45, 27 ff. (= 42, 27ff. in the Veṅkaṭeśvara edition of sampvat 1967);

2. Vā 4, 5ff., almost identical with Bḍ 1, 3, 1ff. (since the nucleus of both works originally was one purāṇa, cp. Kirfel, PP, Introduction, p. Xff.; but there are many corrupt readings in Bḍ, and a few additions, in Vā); Kū 4, 5ff. and L 70, 2ff. which are both dependent on the ancient nucleus of Vā-Bḍ; Kū, however, has utilized the text of Vi also);

3. Pd 5, 2, 82ff. and Vi 1, 2, 1ff. (both are largely identical, but Vi presents some characteristic innovations. In the beginning of the account, and at a few later places, there are lacunae in Pd, so that for some portions we have to depend on Vi alone).

The version of (Pd-)Vi shows clear traces of having been composed on the model of Mr, a dependence which we shall afterwards often have occasion to observe. Ultimately, therefore, there were only two versions: Mr and Vā-Bḍ. Pd-Vi was modelled after Mr, but with such characteristic changes that it must be reckoned as an independent, though secondary, version. At a later time, Kū was composed, and the latest to arise was perhaps the text of L.

---

12. When both TG IIA and TG IIB are meant, I will henceforward use the symbol TG II.

In giving the numbers of the initial verses of the versions, I have included introductory material (which is reproduced in PP only when it is more or less identical in at least two *purāṇas*). Now these prefaces display great variety. Though the bulk of the cosmogony is largely identical in all the seven *purāṇas*, there are six different prefaces: in Vā-Bḍ, Kū, L, Mr, Pd, and Vi. This entails the conclusion that none of the introductions originally belonged to the account of cosmogony. The same result is arrived at when the contents of the cosmogony are compared with those of the introductions. For the cosmogony is, as we shall see, purely mechanistic; the prefaces, on the other hand, are all theistic: Mr and Vā-Bḍ are Brahmaïte, Kū and L Śivaite, Pd shows a state of transition from Brahmaïsism to Viṣṇuism, Vi is as markedly Viṣṇuite as L is Śivaite. We will not discuss the prefaces in detail. The account proper begins with PP 45, 8, left side, or 45, 7c, right side.

Text of PP 45, 8, left side (45, 7c, right side)—46, 10:

Mr :

*pradhānam kārṇaṇaṁ yat tad  
avyaktāśākhyaṁ maharāyaḥ  
yad āhuh prakṛtiṁ sūkṣmām  
nityāṁ sad-asad-ātmikām (8)  
dhruvam akṣayyam ajaram  
ameyaṁ nānya-saṁśrayam  
gandha-rūpa-rasair hīnaṁ  
śabda-sparśa-vivarjitam (9)*

Vā, Bḍ, Kū, L :

*avyaktam kārṇaṇaṁ yat tan  
nityam sad-asad-ātmakam (7)  
pradhānam prakṛtiṁ cāiva  
yam āhus tattva-cintakāḥ  
gandha-varṇa-rasair hīnam  
śabda-sparśa-vivarjitam (8)  
ajaram dhruvam akṣayyam  
nityam svātmam avasthitam  
jagad-yoniṁ mahā-bhūtaṁ  
param brahma sanātanam  
avyaktam abhavat kila (9)*

Mr, Vā, Bḍ, Kū, L :

*anādy-antam ajam sūkṣmam triguṇam pradhavdpyayam  
(v. l. : jagad-yoniṁ, Mr)  
asāṁpratam avijñeyaṁ brahmāgre samavartata<sup>13</sup> (10).*

13. The reading *samāvartata* in Kirfel's text is a misprint.

These verses present a puzzling picture. There are words and lines and ideas identical in both versions, but it is impossible to arrange this material in such a way that one of the versions would be reduced to the other or both derived from a common source. Dilapidation of manuscripts surely cannot account for the divergencies of the texts. For then it would be unexplainable why most of the ideas recur in each of the old versions. The only way out of the impasse is to search in the verses for such material as can be regarded as ancient and to assume that this material was later increased by the redactor of either version.

Now it is in fact possible to find out such ancient material. It consists of three lines. The first of these, which indubitably was the initial line of the whole tract, is the following :

*aryakṭam kārṇam yat tan nityam sad-asad-ātmakam.*

In Vā, Bḍ, and Kū this line follows immediately after the preface (PP 45, 7 right side). Its two pādas, separated by other words, occur also at Vi 1, 2, 19a and 19d<sup>14</sup> (PP 7, 4<sub>g</sub>). It was even inserted into the beginning of TG I (PP 2, 3a—b) by a redactor who wanted to adapt that old cosmogony to views current at his time (cp. my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*), and the cosmogony of the Manusmṛti also contains it, with a slightly different arrangement of the words (M 11 a—b). In Mr, the line is not completely preserved, but the redactor betrays that he knew it by adapting to his new version (with which we will deal below).

Then, after a passage in which the versions diverge, there comes a verse which is largely identical in Mr and Vā-Bḍ :

*anādy-antam ajam sūkṣmam triguṇam prabhavāpyayam*

(v 1. : *jayaḍ-yoniṃ*, Mr)

*asāṃpratam avijñeyam brahṇāgre samavartata* (PP 46, 10).

It is evident that this verse has been taken over from the cosmogony of Śp 224, where it is verse 11 (cp. above, p. 305).

<sup>14</sup> In Pd, this part of the tract is not preserved, either by deliberate omission or on account of a lacuna in a MS.

However, if we are right in assuming that this verse in the original form of the tract followed immediately after the line *avyaktam kārṇam*..., we must, in explaining this verse and those preceding it in PP, start from that form which it had originally and which is preserved at Śp 224, 11 :

*anādy-antam ajam divyam ajaram dhruvam avyayam  
apratarkyam avijñeyam brahmdgre sampravartate.*

As for the change of *sampravartate* into *samavartata*, cp. above pp. 306 f. with footnote 4. The change of *apratarkyam* into *asāṃpratam* may be due to the consideration that the former word is to some extent synonymous with *avijñeyam*, whereas *asāṃpratam* ("not of the present time") brings in a new idea.

In the first line, *divyam* was eliminated in all versions, presumably because the redactor did not want to attribute a celestial or supermundane character to the *brahman* which in this context is completely identified with primary matter. But the substitutes for the word are different in the old versions. Vā-Bḍ has replaced it by *sūkṣmam*, an adjective which characterizes the primary matter of the Sāṅkhya system; Mr has deleted both *ajam* and *divyam*, filling their place with *jagadyoniṃ*. However, neither, did Mr dispense with *sūkṣma*, nor would Vā-Bḍ do without *jagadyoni*, Mr relegating *sūkṣma* to PP 45, 8 (left side), where it figures as an attribute of *prakṛti*, and Vā-Bḍ transporting *jagadyoni* to PP 45, 9 (right side) as an apposition to *avyaktam kārṇam*. So it is probable that the two words were taken by either version from the same source, but inserted into the text of the Sāṅkhya tract in different ways.

The same theory holds good for the change we have to consider next. In the second pāda, *avyaya* was—on grounds I cannot account for—replaced by *akṣayya*, and the three words were in both versions shifted to the preceding verse, but to different places and in different arrangement (Mr : *dhruvam akṣayyam ajaram*; Vā-Bḍ : *ajaram* [v. l. : *ajātam*] *dhruvam akṣayyam*). The pāda was then filled up by the insertion of the words *triṇuṇam prabhavāpyayam* in both versions—obviously



with the intention of mentioning Sāṅkhya notions, which had been absent in the Śp cosmogony to which the verse originally belonged. So if the two versions agree in inserting in 46, 10 the words *triguṇam prabhavāpyayam* (which they took from a common source) and in relegating the original words of that pāda to a preceding verse, they differ in the way they have modelled these preceding verses.

These verses in both versions include the idea that *avyakta*, *pradhāna*, and *prakṛti* are synonymous, though the synonymity is expressed more pronouncedly in Vā-Bḍ than in Mr; besides, they give further characterization of the Unevolved Cause. That the wording of 45, 8 is not original in the form it has in Mr, is also borne out by the fact that, after three feminine adjectives qualifying *prakṛti* in the *yad-āhuḥ* clause, the text continues with neuter adjectives to be construed with *kāraṇam* (45, 8) or with *brahma* (46, 10), which is a somewhat awkward construction and a safe indication of an alteration. Again, the fact that in the sequel (46, 12, left side) *pradhāna* is said to have *originated*, also strongly tells against the assumption that the text had originally stated *avyakta*, *prakṛti*, and *pradhāna* to be so synonymous as Vā-Bḍ asserts them to be. In fact, *avyakta* seems to have been not only the most current term to denote primary matter<sup>15</sup>, but perhaps the oldest one too. In the perface of the cosmogonic tract in Vi (PP 7, 4<sub>7</sub>), three words of the Mr version of 46, 10 are incorporated, which again shows that Mr was used by Vi.

The two pādas

*gandha-rūpa-rasair hīnam śabda-sparśa-vivarjitam*

may have belonged to the original tract since they are attested by Mr, (Vā-) Bḍ and, partly, by Vi (PP, 7, 4<sub>8</sub>).

Now if we attempt to restore the original wording of the initial verses of the tract, the only possible hypothesis is to assume that in their most ancient form they consisted only of the three lines we have considered above, i. e. PP 45, 7c-d,

<sup>15</sup> Cp. E. H. Johnston *Early Sāṅkhya* (London, 1937) p. 26 ff.

right side, and Śp 224, 11, with the addition perhaps of PP 45,9c—d, left side=45,8c—d, right side. If we admit one of the changes introduced into 46, 10 by either Mr or Vā-Bḍ, it will entail the other changes in the preceding verses of either Mr or Vā-Bḍ so that the two versions will fall asunder. Therefore, we have to assume that the compiler of the tract took the verse which is Śp 224, 11 as it was and prefixed to it a line declaring the *brahman* of the following verse to be the Unevolved Cause. Subsequently, the redactor of Mr introduced some changes and additions. In the first verse, he did not entirely identify the three terms *avyakta*, *pradhāna* and *prakṛti*, but retained *avyakta* as the main term, only adding that it was the "Main Cause" (*pradhānam kāraṇam*) and that the Great Ṛṣi called it "Subtle Primary Matter" (*prakṛtiṃ sūkṣmāṃ*). After this, Vā-Bḍ was redacted. Its redactor knew the ancient tract and Mr. He thought it fit to restore the initial line to its original form, to which he added two pādas which completely identify the three terms (PP 45, 8a—b, right side). This change then entailed others. *sūkṣma* could no longer get a place as an attribute of *prakṛti*; so the redactor placed it in 46, 10, restoring at the same time the ancient *aṣṭam*, but relegating *jagadyoni* to the preceding verse. Why he replaced the pāda *ameyam nānyasany-śrayam* by *nityam svātmany avasthitam* and changed the place of the half verse *gandharūparasaśrīṇaṃ śabdasparśavarūjitam*, is not clear. He changed the arrangement of the words *dhruvam akṣayyam ajaram* to render the metre more correct. At the end of 9, he anticipated the description of the *avyakta* as *brahman* because he wanted to take *brahmāgre* in 46, 10 as *Brahmā* *ag* (cp. below, p. 324). He added the description of the *brahman* as a Great Being and as the Body of all beings (9c, e). So the wording of Vā-Bḍ can be explained on the assumption that the redactor of this version utilized the ancient tract as well as the version of Mr. On the other hand, it is not conceivable that, conversely, Mr should have been redacted under the influence of Vā-Bḍ. It is, e. g., highly improbable that the redactor of Mr, in altering the four initial pādas of Vā-Bḍ, should have taken *sūkṣma* from 46, 10 and at the same time shifted *jagadyoni* from

45, 9 to 46, 10; and it is quite impossible that he should have omitted the mention of *brah̥ma* in 46, 9d (right side) if he also, as the redactor of Vā-Bḍ did, had taken *brahmāgre* in 46, 10 as *Brahmā agre*.

So the result of our investigation is that Mr is anterior to Vā-Bḍ. This is corroborated by a scrutiny of the subsequent verses.

The possibility, which has also to be considered, that 46, 10 might have been added to the text later (with a view to adapting it to the earlier tract of Śp 224) can safely be denied. For there are more facts than one to indicate that the verse formed an integral part of the tract *ab initio* :

(a) Parts of the cosmogonic account of Śp 224 occur elsewhere in the 1st chapter of TG II also, and it is impossible to omit them without removing essential parts of the cosmogony; so the author must have deliberately shaped his cosmogony on the model of the account which is preserved in Śp 224 ;

(b) The verse is attested by all the three versions, Mr and Vā-Bḍ quoting it in full, and V<sub>1</sub> using parts of it ;

(c) The ancient pāda *ajaram dhruvam akṣayyam* (for *avyayam*), though removed from its original place, is also attested by all the three versions ;

(d) Parts of the new material of both Mr and Vā-Bḍ are inserted in the verse differently in both versions.

To summarize the contents, we may state :

The Unevolved Cause [which is also called *prakṛti* and *pradhāna*], which is everlasting (*nitya*) and neither being nor non-being; which is devoid of smell, colour, taste, sound, and tangibility (i. e. not perceptible by any of the senses); which is ageless, stable, and imperishable; [which is unknowable and not dependent on anything else (Mr, V<sub>1</sub>)—or : which constantly rests in its own self (Vā-Bḍ)]; which is the origin of the world [which is a Great Being, the eternal, highest *Brahman*, and the body of all that has become (Vā-Bḍ)] —is the *Brahman* without

beginning or end, unborn, subtle, consisting of the three Qualities, the origin and the (place of) reabsorption (of all things), not of the present time, incognizable: (this *Brahman*) existed in the beginning.

It is of importance to note that the text of this tract retains the description of the primeval state as *brahman*. Whether this term was original in the genuine Sāṅkhya or grafted upon the system secondarily by harmonizers, is a question which cannot be decided on the basis of the texts dealt with in this article. Anyhow, the data of the two texts, Śp 224 and TG II, in combination with the history of the Vedānta, suggest the interpretation that there was a bifurcation of the *brahman* monism of the early upaniṣads: one line leading to the spiritualistic monism of later Vedānta philosophy, which was preformed in the early texts, and a second one, also foreshadowed in some early upaniṣad texts, leading eventually to the identification of *brahman* with primary matter in PP 45, 8 (7)—46, 10. The existence of the latter view is also attested by Gauḍapāda, who mentions *brahman* as a synonym of *prakṛti*, *pradhāna* and *avyakta* in his commentary on Sāṅkhyakārikā 22.

Text of PP 46, 11—12 :

Mr (45, 35—36) :

*pralayasyaṅnu tenēdam  
vyāptam āsīd aśeṣataḥ |  
guṇa-sāmyāt tatas tasmāt*

*kṣetrajñādhisṭhitān mune (11)*

*guṇa-bhāvāt sījyamānāt*

*sarga-kāle tataḥ punaḥ |*

*pradhānam tattvam udbhūtam*

*mahāntam tat samāvṛṇōt (12)*

Vā (4, 22c—24) :

*tasyātmanā sarvam idam*

*vyāptam āsīt tamomayam |*

*guṇa-sāmye tadā tasmin*

*guṇa-bhāve tamomaye |*

*sarga-kāle pradhānasya*

*kṣetrajñādhisṭhitasya vai (11)*

*guṇa-bhāvāt vācyamāno*

*mahān prādurbalbhūra ha |*

*sūkṣmeṇa mahatā so 'tū*

*avyaktena samāvṛtaḥ (12)*

Parallels of Vi :

Vi 1, 2, 21c—d (PP 7, 4c—d) :

*tenāgre sarvam evāśīd vyāptam vai pralayaḍ anu*

Vi 1, 2, 33—34b (PP 8,6—7b) :

*guṇa-sāmyāt tatas tasmāt kṣetrajñādhikṣhitān mune*

.....  
*pradhāna-tattvaṃ udbhūtaṃ mahāntaṃ tat samāvṛjot.*

The readings of Vā may represent those of the Vā-Bḍ nucleus. They produce the impression of an attempt, though not a very skillful one, to reinterpret some statements of Mr which the redactor found puzzling. He understood all the words of 46, 10, up to *aviññeyam*, as qualifying the *avyaktaṃ* (45, 9f., right side), but took *brahmāgre* as *Brahmā agre*, i. e. he found here a reference to the personal Creator, probably because the masculine *Brahmā* is signified at another place of the same text (PP 51, 58) by the same words in an unmistakable context (*ādikartā ca bhūtānāṃ Brahmāgre samavartata*), even in Mr. Therefore, in order to maintain the identification of the *avyakta* with the *brahman*, he inserted a mention of the neuter *brahman* in the preceding verse (*param brahma sanātanaṃ* 45, 9d, right side). In 46, 11a also, he deemed a change necessary. The demonstrative pronoun of this pāda can only refer to the word *brahma* or *Brahmā* of the preceding pāda. The redactor, who thought that *Brahmā* was meant there, saw the idea of the *Puruṣasūktā* and of such passages as PP 5, 25c—d of TG I (*divaṃ ca pṛthivīm oṣiva mahimnā vyāpya tiṣṭhati*) expressed in the *vyāptam* of 46, 11; but it seemed to him too indistinct an expression to say that the universe was pervaded "by him". So he changed the *tena* of Mr into *tasyātmanā*—i.e., "by his self" the universe was pervaded—, an expression which unmistakably refers to a person. So here again Vā-Bḍ is clearly secondary as compared with Mr.

In the next pādas, there is a slight unevenness in the text of Mr. For not only is the state of equipoise of the *guṇas* expressed in two different words, *guṇasāmyāt* and *guṇabhāvāt*, but, the sense of "then" is also expressed twice, by *tataḥ* in 11c and *tataḥ punaḥ* in 12b. It is hard to conceive that this is original. I think that the half-verse *guṇasāmyāt tatas tasmāt kṣetrajñādhikṣhitān mune* is an interpolation and that it was the redactor of

Mr who inserted it into the old Sāṅkhya tract. The purpose of the insertion was, firstly, to explain the somewhat obscure *guṇabhārāt* of 12a—which was altogether dropped by Vi—by the unambiguous *guṇasāmyāt*. Secondly, the interpolator thought it fit also to mention the personal Creator's activity at the beginning of the creation (the redactor of Vā-Bḍ had found a reference to the Creator in 10.1 as we have seen); so he added *kaṭrajñāthi-śhitāt*.<sup>15a</sup> But if the original account had made any mention of the Creator, it would be rather surprising that it should have done so only in one member of a compound word, after the lengthy description that was given of the primeval state of the world. Hindu cosmogonic tracts that are originally theistic start by more or less elaborate characterizations of the Creator and sometimes even with words of adoration addressed to him. Moreover, all the seven purāṇas which have incorporated the Sāṅkhyic account of cosmogony follow this practice, but, as we have seen, these prefaces were added by the redactors of the several purāṇas and none of them formed part of the Sāṅkhya tract. Therefore, the brief mention of the *kaṭrajña* makes the pāda in which it occurs suspicious, and the following vocative (*manu-*) only adds to the suspicion, though the compiler of Vi thought it fit to retain it. For it is hardly conceivable that there was any vocative in the original Sāṅkhya tract.

In 11c—12b, the twisted syntax of the verses of Vā-Bḍ is a clear indication of the secondary origin of this version. It is of importance to note that in Vā-Bḍ the *Mahān* is the first product of the emanation process, whereas in Mr.—and, after it, in Vi—the *pradhānam tattvam* arises first. Vā-Bḍ has combined *pradhāna* with *sargakāle* in a genitive which most probably is meant to say, not that the *pradhāna* was emitted from the *brahman* or *avyakta* (genitivus objectivus), but that it emitted the products of creation (genitivus subjectivus), *avyakta* and *pradhāna* were absolutely synonymous to the redactor of Vā-Bḍ, but not to the author of the ancient tract as becomes clear from Mr 45, 36

15a. *Ācraja* is here to be understood as a synonym of *Brahmā*; cp. PP. 51, 57 : *Ācrajaṇo Brahma-saṃjñitah* (Mr, Vā-Bḍ, Kā, L).

(PP. 46, 12, left side), where it is said that from the State of *Guṇas* (of the Unevolved Cause) the Main Principle (*pradhānam tattvam*) arose. Vi has retained this old view, and a number of variant readings in the whole tract also indicate that *avyakta* (*kāraṇam*) and *pradhānam* (*tattvan*) were not originally synonymous, though identified later. Nor was *prakṛti* originally a synonym of *avyakta* and *pradhāna*; as 53, 64d shows, the old tract knew of eight *prakṛtis*, but nowhere, except in the initial verse, which is a product of later remodelling, was one *prakṛti* mentioned. I think it is important to bear in mind the difference that was observed by the ancient Sāṅkhya tract in the use of the three terms.

According to Mr, the text of which may here represent that of the original Short Tract, "at the time of emanation the Main Principle arose from the State of *Guṇas*, while this was being sent forth", i. e. while the Three Qualities were losing their undifferentiated state of equipoise and becoming manifest as characterizers of things. In Mr, as in Pd-Vi, the *mahān* is not expressly stated to have become manifest. The text mentions it only as having been covered or enveloped by the Main Principle, and this envelopment is further described in the following verse (PP 46, 13; see below). In the sequel of the account, each following *tanmātra* element is stated to have been "enveloped" by, after it had been manifested by emanation from, the *tanmātra* preceding it in the series.

Mr (45, 37) :

*yathā bījāṃ tvacā tadvad  
avyaktenāvṛto mahān  
sāttviko rājasaś oḍiva  
tāmasaś ca tridhāditāḥ*

Vi (1, 2, 34c—f) |

Pd (5, 88c—89 b) :

*sāttviko rājasaś oḍiva  
tāmasaś ca tridhā mahān  
pradhāna-tattvena samam  
tvacā bījāṃ tvāvṛtam.*

(The corresponding text of Vā-Bd is negligible).

In this case, I would give preference to the text of Pd-Vi, firstly because it has the advantage of being the *lectio difficilior*, secondly because it retains the word *pradhānatattva*, not replacing

it by *avyakta* (which was not originally synonymous with *pradhānatattva*).

Translation of PP 8, 7c—f :

“The *Mahān* is threefold : consisting of goodness, passion, and darkness. As a seed is enveloped by its rind, in the same way (the *Mahān* is enveloped) by the Main Principle”.

After the mention of the *Mahān*, Vā-Bd has a long interpolation (46, 14—48, 30) in which the Great One is denied and identified with *Brahmā* and many other entities. We will pass over that passage.

Text of PP 48, 31—49, 38/ 8,—9, 15 :

For the following verses, a fairly good text can be constituted on the basis of Mr and Pd-Vi, with utilization of Vā-Bd at some passages. After each line, I note the purāṇas on which my text is mainly based.

*tatas tasmād ahaṃkāras trividho vai vyajāyate* (Mr)  
*vaikārikas taijasaś ca bhūtādīś ca sa tāmasaḥ* (Mr)  
*yathā pradhānena<sup>1</sup>) mahān mahatā sa tūhārtuḥ* (Vi)  
*bhūtādīś tu vikurvāṇaḥ śabda-tanmātrakaṃ tataḥ* (Mr, Vi)  
*sasarja śabda-tanmātrād ākāśaṃ śabda-lakṣaṇam* (Mr, Vi)  
*ākāśaṃ śabda-mātram tu bhūtādīś cāvopat tataḥ* (Mr)  
*ākāśas tu vikurvāṇaḥ sparśa-mātram sasarja ha<sup>2</sup>)* (Vā, Pd-Vi)  
*balavān jāyate vāyus tasya sparśo guṇo mataḥ<sup>3</sup>)* (Mr)  
*ākāśaṃ śabda-mātram tu sparśa-mātram sambhūyate<sup>4</sup>)* (Vā, Vi)  
*vāyus cāpi vikurvāṇo rūpa-mātram sasarja ha* (Mr, Vā)  
*jyotiḥ utpadyate vāyos tad rūpa-guṇam ucyate<sup>5</sup>)* (Mr, Vā, Vi)  
*sparśa-mātram<sup>6</sup>) tu vai vāyū rūpa-mātram sambhūyate* (Vi)  
*jyotiś cāpi vikurvāṇaṃ rasa-mātram sasarja ha* (Mr, Pd-Vi)  
*sambhāvanti tato hy āpaś cāsan vai tā rasatmikāḥ<sup>7</sup>)* (Mr)  
*rasa-mātram tu tā hy āpo<sup>8</sup>) rūpa-mātram sambhūyo* (Mr)  
*āpaś cāpi vikurvāṇo<sup>9</sup>) gandha-mātram sasarjit* (Mr)  
*samghāto jāyate tasmāt tasya gandho guṇo mataḥ* (Mr, Vi).  
 Notes :

1) The text of Mr has here again *avyakta* instead of *pradhānena*, but after what preceded I think that only *pradhānena*



is possible if we want to restore the original terminology of the tract. The redactor of Vi must have taken the word from the original independent tract. Cp. note 4.

- <sup>3)</sup> In this line, Mr is not original ; possibly the MS used by the redactor of Mr had been corrupt here. The *nātra saṁśayaḥ* of Mr is a clear sign of the secondary origin of the line.
- <sup>4)</sup> This line is identical with Śp 224, 36c—d.
- <sup>5)</sup> This line is lacking in Mr and in Pd. Vi has restored it ; so the redactor of that version must have utilized more than one MS or version : not only Pd and Mr, but probably Vā(·Bd) also, if he did not take the line from the original independent tract.
- <sup>6)</sup> The last pāda is identical with Śp 224, 37d.
- <sup>7)</sup> Mr : *sparsā-mātras tu vai vāyū* ; Vā : *sparsā-mātram tu vai vāyo* ; Vi (1, 2, 41c Gorakhpur ed. ; 1, 2, 39g Calcutta ed. of 1882) : *sparsāmātram tu vai vāyū*. The latter reading (*lectio difficilior*) seems to be the original one, which was replaced in Mr and Vā by constructions that are grammatically clearer but have no parallels in the rest of the tract. *vāyuḥ* (*vāyū*) is an apposition to *sparsā-mātram*. All the *mātra*-compounds of the tract are nouns, not adjectives.
- <sup>8)</sup> *rasātmikāḥ* also at Śp 224, 38 b.
- <sup>9)</sup> It is not necessary to see in *āpo* a grammatical mistake (a nominative employed as an accusative) as Paigiter (in his translation of Mr, Calcutta, 1904, Bibl. Ind.) and Kirfel (who puts the mark [l] after *āpo*) had done. If we adopt the reading of Mr, *rasāmātram* (instead of *-āḥ*), *tā hy āpo* may be construed as a short independent sentence : "for this is water". Pd-Vi has removed the difficulty by substituting *ambhāṁsi* for *āpaḥ*.
- <sup>10)</sup> The *parasmaipada* participle is surprising. May we replace it by *vikurvāṇā* on the authority of Pd-Vi (which have *vikurvāṇāni*, *cāmbhāṁsi*, PP 9, 15) and Kā (which has *āḥ aś*

*cāpi vikurvāṇā*, but is perhaps the latest of the extant versions of the tract) ?

Translation :

From this (*Mahān*) then arose the threefold Egoity : that one which is Subject to Modifications, the Glowing (or : Passionate) One, and the Origin of the Elements which consists of darkness. It was enveloped by the *Mahān* as the *Mahān* was by the Main (Principle). Then the Origin of the Elements, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Sound, and from this the Ether, which is characterized by sound, (arose). The Origin of the Elements, however, then enveloped the ether, (which had the form of) the subtle matter of sound. The ether, while differentiating itself, produced the Subtle Matter of Palpability, (thus) the strong Wind is born ; palpability is known to be its property. But the ether, (which had the form of the) subtle matter of sound, enveloped the subtle matter of palpability. Then the wind, while differentiating itself, produced the Subtle Matter of Visibility. Light arises from the wind ; its property is called visibility. The wind, however, (which had the form of the) subtle matter of palpability, enveloped the subtle matter of visibility. Light, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Taste. From that, Water arises : its essence is taste. The subtle matter of visibility enveloped the subtle matter of taste, which is water. Water, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Smell. From that, the Aggregate is born ; smell is known to be its property.

After this account of elemental emanation, Vā has the line *rasamātram tu tat toyam gandha-mātram samāhṛat* (PP 49, 3-4). But this line occurs in none of the other versions, not even in L., which is throughout dependent on Vā. We have therefore to assume that the original tract did not mention the "envelopment" of the subtle matter of smell by that of taste and that the line was interpolated in Vā after the redaction of L.—As the last product of the emanation process one would expect to find earth. Instead, the text has *samghāta*, "the Aggregate". This term suggests the view of the *accumulation theory* that earth includes subtle particles of all the elements preceding it in the series of

emanation. But it is not this idea which is brought out by the mention of "envelopment". For the accumulation theory does not, as the *envolopment* theory does, teach the reabsorption of a following *tanmātra* by the preceding one but, conversely, the admixture of particles of all preceding elements to each item of the emanation series.

A comparison with Śp 224.

Here it becomes evident that the whole tract on cosmo-gonic emanation has been composed on the pattern of the cosmogony of Śp 224. In fact, it is nothing but a *remodelling of the old account* with the inclusion of the more developed views of a later time. The *Manas*, which "differentiates from itself the creation" (*astim vikurute*), has been dropped, but the *Mahān* is here intermediate between the Main Principle and the *Ahaṁkāra*; in the process of emanation *Tanmātras* are interposed between each preceding and each following element; there is the idea that, after a gross element had evolved from its Subtle Particles, these are "enveloped" by the element preceding in the series; and there is, at the beginning of the tract, the idea of the subtle, imperceptible Primary matter, consisting of Three Qualities. All this corresponds to a form of the Sāṅkhya system, though not of that of the Kārikā.

Much material of the ancient tract of Śp 224 has been incorporated into the later one. Not only has the old introductory verse (Śp 224, 11) been preserved, with some modifications, but the terms *vikurvāṇa* has been retained, and even the word *guṇa*, though in the same tract occurring in the later sense of "Quality of the Unevolved Cause", has at the same time been used in the old technical sense of "Property of an Element" (later Śp texts<sup>a</sup> replaced it by *viśeṣa* in this sense). Further, one line, one pāda and one expression have been preserved. And, though the whole account was conceived in past tenses, the present tense *jāyate* of the line taken from Śp

<sup>a</sup> 16 E. g. Śp (CE) 298, 14 and 299, 11 = Bombay ed. (Poona reprint of 1982) 310, 14 and 311, 12.

224, 36 drew after it even a few further cases of use of the present tense (*utpadyate, sambhavanti, jāyate*).

Frauwallner observes in his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (vol. 1, p. 303) that the evolution theory of the Sāṅkhya was probably shaped on the model of the *Sukānuprasāna* cosmogony (i. e., Śp 224). This statement is now corroborated by textual history. Nay, the purāṇas even contain an ancient tract—earlier than the 4th century A.D.<sup>17</sup>—which describes the whole process of cosmogony on the lines of a form of the Sāṅkhya system. I am convinced that this text is another instance of a Short Instructional Tract, which had once existed independently, but was then incorporated into works of the anonymous literature and has thus come down to us.

Text of PP 49, 39—50, 45b (cp. 9, 15<sub>1</sub>—18) :

[*tasmims tasmims tu tan-mātrāṃ tena tanmātrātā smrtā*

(v. 1: *tan-mātrā Vā, Vi*)

*aviśeṣa-vācakatvād aviśeṣas tataś ca te* (39)

*na śāntā nāpi ghorās te na mūḍhāś cāviśeṣanāḥ*

*bhūta-tanmātra-sargo 'yam ahaṃkāraṭ tu tāmasāt* (40)

*vaiikārikāt ahaṃkāraṭ sattvādriktāt tu cāttvikāt*

*vaiikārikāḥ sa sargas tu yugapat sampravartate* (41)

*buddhīndriyāṇi pañcādiva pañca karmīndriyāṇi ca<sup>1)</sup>*]

*taṭjasānīndriyāṇy āhur devā vaiikārikā daśa* (42)

[*ekādaśaṃ manas tatra devā vaiikārikāḥ smrtāḥ<sup>1)</sup>*]

*śrotraṃ tvak cakṣuṣī jihvā nāsikā cādiva pañcamī<sup>2)</sup>* (43)

*śabdādānām avāpty-arthaṃ buddhi-yuktāni cakṣute<sup>4)</sup>*

*pādaṃ pāyur upasthaś ca hastau vāk pañcamī bhavet* (44)

*gutir visargo hy ānandaḥ śilpaṃ vākyaṃ ca karma tat* (45a—b,

This text has throughout been given according to Mr.

#### NOTES :

<sup>1)</sup> 39—42b are missing in Pd. As there are a number of

17. The cosmogony of TG II belongs to nucleus of Vā-B], which was redacted shortly after 335 A. D. (cp. PP, Introduction, p. XVIII f., and my monograph *Prahlāda* [Mailz, 1959] p. 24; consequently it must be considerably older.

apparent lacunae in the cosmogonic account of that purāṇa, the absence of the seven lines is not by itself an indication of their being unoriginal. But there are some features of the contents of these lines which are apt to rouse doubts as to their having belonged to the original form of the independent Short Tract.

(1) The preceding account had not only, as 40c—d states, described the emanation of the *tanmātras* but had mentioned the origination of the *gross* elements also. Therefore, neither is 40c—d exact nor does the form of the preceding account, which does not specially treat of *tanmātras*, suggest a necessity for an explanation of this term at this place. On the other hand, 39c—40b are so similar to Sāṅkhyakārikā 38 (*tanmātrāṇy aviśeṣāś tebhyo bhūtāni pañca pañcubhyaḥ | ete smṛtā viśeṣāḥ sātā ghorāś ca mūḍhāś ca*) that the idea suggests itself that they were composed and inserted to adapt the doctrine of the tract to that of the Kārikā.

(2) The same idea is suggested by 40c—42b, which remind of the Kārikās 24—25. According to these two Kārikās there are two sorts of emanation: the *tanmātraḥ sargaḥ*, which is *tāmasa*, and the *ekādaśakaḥ sargaḥ* of the senses, which is *sāttvika* and proceeds from the *vaikārika* or *vaikṛta* form of the *ahamkāra*, and it is this idea which is expressed in 40c—42b. However, to reproduce the contents of Kārikā 25 completely, it would have been necessary also to state that the *taijasa* form of the *ahamkāra* was operative in both the *tāmasa* and *sāttvika* (or *vaikārika*) emanations. This would have created a glaring contradiction to 42c, which reserves the attribute *taijasa* to the senses. But while this was avoided, an inconsistency arose all the same, for in 42c—d the senses were called *taijasa*, whereas in the (interpolated) lines 41—42b they were derived from the *vaikārika* form of the *ahamkāra*, (42c—d will be discussed in the following note).

Vi has 39 and 40 (with a few variants) but omits 41—42a. Perhaps the redactor of Vi felt that 41—42a, besides being absent in the old independent tract, were not in harmony with 42c—d; so he omitted these lines though he took 39—40 from Mr.

Apparently the intention of harmonizing the tract with the doctrine of a text (the Sāṅkhyakārikā) which (in the meantime ?) had become recognized as authoritative, could not fully succeed, since it was combined with the traditionalist tendency of preserving the old text. There is one line (40c—d) which is not in harmony with the *preceding* account and there are others (41 a—42 b) which are not in keeping with the *following* (42c—d). As for the rest, there are two lines (39c—40b) which, though not inconsistent with the context, have also evidently been composed under the influence of the Kārikā, whereas the line 39 a—b produces the impression of having been added by a redactor who found that a definition of the term *tanmātra* was necessary as an introduction to 39c—40d; it is improbable that the original tract, which left unexplained other obscure terms (e. g. *vaikārika*), should have given a definition of *tanmātra* at the end of what was not an account of *bhūta-tanmātra-sarga* but a description of the emanation of the (gross) elements with each *tanmātra* emanating from the gross element preceding it in the series and each *tanmātra* immediately producing the corresponding gross element.

Therefore it is probable that the original Short Tract did not contain the lines 39a—42b and that Pd, in omitting them, has preserved a feature of the original tract.

42c—d must be regarded as original. For while the statement of 41—42b that the senses are a product of the *vaikārik-sarga* is easily traceable to the influence of another text, the description of the senses as *taijasa* seems to be peculiar to the Short Tract of Emanation. It must therefore be assumed that the original Tract, after describing the emanation from

"the *bhūtādi*, which is *tāmasa*", continued by stating : "The senses are called *taijasa*", thus suggesting only implicitly that they proceeded from the *taijasa* form of the *ahamkāra*. A similar implicit statement we met with at the beginning of the account where the origination of the *mahān* was not expressly stated (cp. above).

42d presents a problem. Two interpretations are possible : the deities mentioned here are either *identical* with the senses or they *preside* over them. The first alternative was adopted by Pargiter in his translation of Mr (Bibl. Ind.), and it may be supported by passages like Śp (CE) 203, 31 (Bombay ed : 210, 33) ; the second possibility would be in keeping with the view of Brahmasūtra 2, 4, 14—16. It seems to me that the second possibility is the more probable one. For if the gods were identical with the senses, these would be *taijasa* and *vaikārika* at the same time according to 42c—d. It would however be more logical if the *tāmasa*, *vaikārika* and *taijasa* forms of the *ahamkāra* each had its own function or products, and it is well understandable that the *vaikārika*, in which *sattva* is predominant, should produce the *gods* presiding over the senses while the senses themselves emanated from the *taijasa*. I would therefore suggest to take 42d to mean : "The ten gods (who control the senses) are *vaikārika*." The redactor, however, who interpolated 41a—42b, certainly did not understand 42d in this sense.

The fact that the *devā vaikārikāḥ* are once more mentioned in 43a—b rouses suspicion as to the originality of this line. Moreover, the line breaks the connexion of 42c—d, which mentions the (ten) senses and the ten deities presiding over them, with 43c—45b, which name these senses and their functions. I think, therefore, that the line has to be rejected and that the original Tract did not mention the *manas* at all—possibly because the *manas* was understood to be included in the *mahān*, which had taken its place in the emanation series. The insertion of a mention of the common

idea of the *manas* as the eleventh sense is easily explainable from that harmonizing tendency which, along with the other tendency of preserving what had been handed down, is one of the forces that dominated the development of texts of the anonymous literature.

The mention of the *manas* was expanded to a full line by a repetition of the statement that the senses were *devā vaikārikāḥ* (43b). 43a—b might perhaps be understood to mean that the mind is the (ten) *vaikārika gods*. The grammatical difficulty involved in this interpretation might be tolerable in a purāṇic text. The resumption of the words *devā vaikārikāḥ* would thus not be a mere repetition but serve a special purpose. The doctrine would be similar to that of Sāṅkhyasūtra 2, 17—19 (cp. Aniruddha's commentary : *āntaram manaḥ iti ekādaśakam indriyam* ; Garbe [ *Die Sāṅkhya-Philosophie*, 2nd ed., pp. 299f.] erroneously states this to be general Sāṅkhya teaching). But the view of the *manas* as the special outcome of the *vaikārika sarga* seems to have arisen at a very late date, whereas the interpolation of 43a—b belongs to an early time since the line occurs in Mr, Pd, and Vi (Vā has remodelled it, and L, here as elsewhere, has followed Vā). Therefore it is not very probable that the interpolator should have intended to express that view.

- <sup>3)</sup> In 42 and 43, Pd and Vi have a number of unimportant variants.
- <sup>4)</sup> *calante* is a conjecture, first proposed by Pargiter in his translation of Mr. The text has *valsyate*, which does not make sense. The emendations of L, Pd and Vi are negligible.

Translation :

"[In each of them there is only that (Vā, Vi : In each of them there is a particle [*mātrā*] of it); this is why tradition speaks (of them) as being *Tanmātras*. And hence they are without differences, for (the word *tanmātra*) is not expressive of difference. They are neither calm, nor terrible, nor dull, being without differences. This emanation of the *tanmātra* of the elements



(proceeds) from the *ahamkāra* characterized by darkness. From the *ahamkāra* subject to modifications, however which is of the nature of goodness (and) possesses goodness in excess, the *vaikārika* emanation begins at the same time : the five knowledge-senses and the five action-senses]. The senses are called glowing (i. e., luminous and vigorous); the ten deities are *vaikārika*. [The mind is among them the eleventh. They are traditionally called the *vaikārika* deities.] The ear, the skin, the eyes, the tongue, and the nose as the fifth are called (organs) connected with knowledge for perceiving sounds and other (sense-objects). The feet, the anus, the organ of generation, the hands, (among which) the voice is the fifth; walking, evacuation, (sexual) delight, manual work, and speech : that is the work (for each of the action-senses)'<sup>18</sup>

### III. Results

(of this study, combined with some results of my paper *Two Accounts of Cosmogony* and my monograph *Prahlāda*)

#### 1. For the history of texts of the anonymous literature :

(a) The oldest version of those parts of the purāṇas which deal with cosmogony on Sāṅkhya lines, is that of Mr. The other original parts of Mr.<sup>19</sup> were evidently redacted at the same time, and this redaction preceded that of the Vā-Bḍ nucleus. The investigation of the cosmogony of Mr leads to the same result at which F. E. Pargiter arrived from quite different considerations<sup>20</sup>, viz. the nucleus of Mr was compiled about 300 A. D. The redaction of Vā-Bḍ is plainly later, and it took place shortly after 335 A. D.<sup>21</sup> After the nucleus of Vā-Bḍ, the cosmogony of Pd was redacted ; then, perhaps about 500 A. D., Vi<sup>22</sup> ; then,

18. The rest of the account of cosmogony of TG II I will leave over for later studies.

19. Cp. F. E. Pargiter's translation of Mr (Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1904), Introduction, pp. iv—vii.

20. Cp. op. cit., Introduction, pp. xix—xx.

21. Cp. PP, Introduction, p. xix, and my *Prahlāda*, pp. 23 f.

22. Cp. my *Prahlāda* pp. 24 and 117 f.

perhaps in the 7th or 8th century, Kū<sup>28</sup>. L is later than Vā-Bḍ, but its chronology in relation to Pd, Vi and Kū cannot yet be determined. Likewise, the question of the time when the single redactions of Vā and Bḍ arose is still unsettled.

(b) Some tracts incorporated in Śp are considerably older than the third century A. D., probably dating from pre-Christian times.

(c) The first adhyāya of the Manusmṛti was composed later than the independent tracts that were incorporated into Śp 224, but earlier than, or approximately at the same time as, the final redaction of Śp 224, presumably in the first centuries A. D.

(d) There are Short Instructional Tracts, which once had an independent existence and were preserved because they were incorporated into the anonymous literature. There are certain laws governing their textual development (modernizations, harmonizations of different traditions, adaptations to the context, juxtaposition of different beginnings).

## 2. For the history of philosophy :

(a) There was an Instructional Tract, composed in the third century A. D. at the latest, which expounded the evolution of the world according to a form of the Sāṅkhya system and is largely preserved in different versions in seven purāṇas.

The Sāṅkhya of the original form of this tract, which can be reconstructed with some amount of probability, is to some extent identical with that of the Sāṅkhyakārikā but deviates from it in some points: (A) *avyakta*, the unevolved cause or primary matter, is distinguished from *pradhāna(tattva)*, which is the first product of its evolution; (B) there is no special *tanmātra-sarga*, but the emanation of the *tanmātras* is combined with that of the gross elements, each following *tanmātra* emanating from the gross element preceding it in the series; (C) after a gross

---

28. Cp. my *Prahlāda*, pp. 193 f. The investigation of the history of the legend of Prahlāda, led to the same results for the relative chronology of Vā-Bḍ, Vi and Kū as the study of the cosmogonical texts of these purāṇas.

element has originated, the *tanmātra* that was its source is "enveloped" (*ā-vr*, *sam-ā-vr*) by the *tanmātra* preceding it in the series ; (D) the ten senses are products of *taijasa* emanation, whereas the results of *vaikārika* emanation seem to be the deities presiding over the senses ; (E) the *manas* does not seem to have been mentioned in the oldest form of the tract.—Later harmonization or modernization has attempted to blur some of these deviations (A, D) and to introduce some ideas from the *Kārikā* (B, E). In view of the fact, detectable by textual criticism, that the old Short Tract was later on interpolated under the influence of the *Sāṅkhyakārikā*, in combination with the dates suggested above, the hypothesis may be ventured that the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* was regarded as an authoritative text as early as 300 A. D. The old Short Tract, however, was composed at a time when the *Kārikā* either was not yet in existence or had not yet received general recognition.

(b) This *Sāṅkhya* tract has been modelled on the pattern of an earlier exposition of the evolution of the world which is preserved in Śp 224. This latter text, which is pre-*Sāṅkhyic*, probably dates from pre-Christian times.

### 3. For the history of religion :

(a) There are clear traces of a constant antagonism between theism and impersonalism in the anonymous literature from pre-Christian times to about the 4th or 5th century A. D.

(b) The data of the anonymous literature point to the existence, in the first centuries B. C. and the first centuries A. D., of an influential Hindu sect that adored *Brahmā* as the highest deity.

(c) About the 4th or 5th century A.D. the glory of *Brahmā* faded away and *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva* took his place, some texts substituting the one, some the other god for *Brahmā*.

(d) From that time, the old opposition between theism and impersonalism was largely replaced by the new antagonism between *Śaiṣvism* and *Vaiṣnavism*.

# मुद्गलपुराणविषयसमालोचनम्

पं० गिरिधरशर्मा चतुर्वेदी

[The Mudgala-Purāṇa is counted among the eighteen Aupa-Purāṇas. It is still unpublished, and is available in manuscripts only. The present article is based on the two manuscripts of the Mudgala-Purāṇa, deposited in the Kāśīrāja-Sarasvatī-Bhaṇḍāra of Ramnagar. It is the summary of a discourse given by the learned author according to the Purāṇa-pravacana-scheme of H. H. the Kāśīnareśa (for which see 'Purāṇa' Vol. III, pp. 401 f.).

The Mudgala-Purāṇa mainly deals with God *Gaṇapati*, his worship and his glorification. He is conceived here as the supreme brahman, all other gods being considered as subordinate to him. *Buddhi* and *Siddhi* are said to be the two forms of his *Māyā*. This Purāṇa presents various conceptions of *Gaṇapati*. In one place he is conceived as the universe-qualified *brahman*—his head being the *brahman*, and his remaining body the universe. In another place he is conceived as *yoga*, the head being the *nīrvikalpa-samādhi* and the body the *sa-vikalpa-samādhi*. Each of the several khaṇḍas of the Mudgala Purāṇa explains a particular name of God *Gaṇapati*. The superiority of Gaṇeśa over the other principal gods—Sūrya, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra-Śiva and Kārtikeya—has been established by means of various episodes or ākhyānas. The symbolism underlying the conception of his protruding belly and the four hands—holding *pāśa*, *aṅkuśa*, *modaka* and *kaṇḍa*, his elephant-face, and his *vāhana*, mouse, is also explained here. Besides, the stories of the birth of Moha and Kārtikeya from the seed of Rudra-Śiva are also narrated, and the

genealogies of the Solar and Lunar dynasties given, where-in Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Yudhiṣṭhira and others are also said to have worshipped *Garapati*.]

मुद्गलपुराणमुपपुराणेषु कचिद् गणितम् । कचित्तु उपपुराणेष्वप्य-  
वरकक्षाकेष्वौपपुराणेषु गण्यते । औपपुराणानि चातिपुरा नाम्नापि केचिदाहुः ।  
एषां नामानि च बृहद्विवेके स्मर्यन्ते—

आद्यं सनत्कुमारं च नारदीयं बृहच्च यत् ।  
आदित्यं मानवं प्रोक्तं नन्दिकेश्वरमेव च ॥  
कौर्मं भागवतं ज्ञेयं वाशिष्ठं भार्गवं तथा ।  
मुद्गलं कल्कि-देव्यौ च महाभागवतं तथा ॥  
बृहद्धर्मं परानन्दं बह्विं पशुपतिं तथा ।  
हरिवंशं ततो ज्ञेयमिदमौपपुराणकम् ॥

अत्र पठितानि सनत्कुमारादीनि कानिचिदुपपुराणेष्वपि पठ्यन्ते—

आद्यं सनत्कुमारोक्तं नारसिंहमथापरम् ।  
तृतीयं स्कान्दमुद्दिष्टं कुमारेण तु भाषितम् ॥  
चतुर्थं शिवधर्माख्यं साक्षान्नन्दीशभाषितम् ।  
दुर्वाससोक्तमाश्चर्यं नारदोक्तमतः परम् ॥  
कपिलं वामनं चैव तथैवोशनसेरितम् ।  
ब्रह्माण्डं वारुणं चाथ कालिकाह्वयमेव ॥  
माहेश्वरं तथा साम्बं सौरं सर्वार्थसंचयम् ।  
पराशरोक्तमपरं मारीचं भास्कराह्वयम् ॥

एतत्सर्वमालोच्य विद्वद्भिः प्रतीयेत यद् यानि कैश्चिदुपपुराणत्वेनोक्तानि  
तान्येव विभज्य कैश्चिदौपपुराणत्वेन पृथग् गणितानि । वस्तुतः सर्वेषामेवामुप-  
पुराणत्वेन गणनं युक्तं प्रतिभाति ।

उपपुराणेषु प्रायेणैकैकां काश्चिद्देवतामुद्दिश्य तन्माहात्म्यमेव विवृतं दृश्यते ।  
यद्यपि महापुराणेष्वपीयं प्रक्रियोपलभ्यते, तत्रापि शैवपुराणेषु भगवतः शिवस्य,  
वैष्णवेषु पुराणेषु च भगवतो विष्णोर्माहात्म्यातिशयः ख्यापित इति, तथापि

उपपुराणेषु तु प्रक्रियेयमतिशयेन विजृम्भिता विलोक्यते । अत्र च परम्परं विरोधो नाशङ्कनीयः । यतो हि सर्वस्यापि चराचरात्मकस्य मूलभूतमेकं परब्रह्म मुख्यतयोपास्यं सर्वत्र विवक्षितम् । तत्तु न स्वरूपेणोपासितुं शक्यम्—“तन्वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह” “अविज्ञातं विज्ञानां विज्ञानमविज्ञानम्” “यन्मनसा न मनुते येनाहुर्मनो मतं, तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुनमते” इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिभिः तस्य वाङ्मनसाविषयतायाः स्पष्टमुद्घुष्टत्वात् । तस्मिन् मनोनिवेशो हि तदुपासनं भवति, यच्च मनोविषयतामेव नादगाहते तत्र मनोनिवेशः कथं कर्तुं शक्यः स्यात् । न वा स्तुतिः तस्य संभवति, चाराचरात्मनः तथा च तदुपासना न संभवतीत्येव फलितम् । उपासनेनैव मनुष्यजीवनस्य साफल्यम्, उपासना च न संभवतीति जीवनस्यैव निष्फलत्वमपनति, ननु तदा सगुणसाकाररूपाण्याधारीकृत्य तस्मिन्मनो निवेश्यमिति श्रुतिस्मृत्यादिषु मार्ग उपदिष्टः । तानि च सगुणसाकाररूपाणि अधिकारिभेदेन पञ्चशास्त्रेषु निर्दिष्टानि यथा विष्णुः, शिवः, शक्तिः गणेशः, सूर्यश्चेति । ते हि देवाः स्वस्वाधिकारे नियुक्ताः स्वस्वकार्यं निर्वहन्ति । एषु कस्मिंश्चिदेकस्मिन् स्वस्वविमर्शमय ब्रह्मबुद्धिरूपासकेन कर्तव्या, तद्रूपं तेनोपासकेन परब्रह्मतया भावनीयम्, अन्यानि तु रूपाणि यथायथं स्वस्वाधिकारविशिष्टान्येव भावनीयानि ।

तदित्थं येन यद्रूपं परब्रह्मतया भावितं तदेव तद्दृष्टौ सर्वतः प्रधानं भवति । अन्यानि तु रूपाणि यथास्थितानि तदनुगामीन्येव स्युः । अनेकेषु रूपेषु ब्रह्मस्य भावितेषु तूपासनैव न सिध्येत् । चित्तस्यैकाग्रता हि उपासनायाः फलम्, अनेकेषु ब्रह्मतया भावितेषु तु इतस्ततः प्रचलच्चित्तं कथमेकाग्रं भवेत् । नन्वाहं ब्रह्मन् इति स्मिन्नेव कस्मिंश्चिद्रूपे कर्तव्या । इतरेषु तु न विद्वेषः कार्यः । अस्मिन्नाधिकारे ते स्थिताः तादृशाधिकारविशिष्टत्वमेव तेषां मन्त्रत्वम् । तथा च परब्रह्मतया भावितस्य रूपस्याङ्गप्रत्यङ्गान्येव तेऽन्ये देवा भवेयुः । परब्रह्मतया भावितं तु रूपं सर्वतः प्रधानमित्येव पुराणेषूपगुणेषु च कस्मिंश्चिदेकस्य प्रधानं तत्र तत्र ख्यापितम् । रुचिमेवकृतोऽधिकारमेव एवात्र निश्चयः, न च अन्यकोऽपि विरोधः ।

तदेतत् पातञ्जले योगसूत्रेऽप्युक्तम् “यथास्थितानिब्रह्मा” इति । यत्र

धिकारिणः स्वभावाद् यत्र रुचिः, तदेव रूपं तेन ध्यातव्यमिति तदर्थः । तदेव रूपं द्वारीकृत्य निर्विकल्पकसमाधिना तस्य ब्रह्मणि प्रवेशः स्यादिति योगसूत्राशयः ।

तद्विस्थं विभिन्नतया मनोनिवेशार्थं स्वीकृतेषु रूपेषु भगवान् गणपतिरेवात्र पुराणे परब्रह्मरूपेण ध्यातुमुपदिष्टः । किञ्चिद्रूपं द्वारीकृत्य प्रवेशोऽपि मायाशबलिते ब्रह्मण्येव संभवति । निष्कलं तु ब्रह्म केवलमुपलक्षणतया निषेधमुखेनैव ज्ञेयं भवेत् । तदर्थं च निर्विकल्प एव समाधिरुपयुक्तः स्यादिति न तद् वाचा वर्णयितुं कथमपि शक्यम्, ततश्च मायाशबलितं ब्रह्मैव गणपतिरिति पुराणेऽस्मिन्नुपदिष्टम् ।

माया च तस्य बुद्धिःसिद्धिरिति द्विविधा ख्यापिता । तत्र बुद्धिः चित्त-शब्देन पययिणात्रोक्ता, पञ्चविधा सा चोक्ता । पञ्चविधत्वं च क्षिप्तं, मूढं, विक्षिप्तम्, एकाग्रं, निरुद्धमिति चित्तस्य टीकाकृता व्याख्यातम् । क्षिप्तं संसारिणां, मूढं भ्रान्तानां, विक्षिप्तं मुमुक्षूणां, विशेषेण ब्रह्मणि क्षिप्तमित्यर्थः एकाग्रं योगे प्रयतमानानां, निरुद्धं च योगिनामिति । एते मेदाः प्रायेण योगदर्शनादेव गृहीताः स्युः । चित्तपदं चेदं शास्त्रेषु बहुधा व्याख्यायते । सांख्यदर्शने मनो-बुद्धिरहङ्कार इति त्रिविधमेवान्तःकरणमुक्तम् । योगदर्शने तु चित्तपदमनेकसूत्रेषु व्यवहृतं दृश्यते । परं तदन्तःकरणपर्यायत्वेनैवोक्तमिति प्रतीयते । वेदान्ति-नश्च मनोबुद्धिरहङ्कारश्चित्तमिति चतुर्धान्तःकरणं व्याचक्षते । संकल्पं, व्यवसायम्, अहंभावं स्मृतिञ्चेति” एतादृशीं च वृत्तिं तेषामभिदधति ।

अथागमशास्त्रे तु “चित्तिरेव चेतनपदादवरूढा चेत्यसंकोचिनी चित्तम्” (प्रत्यभिज्ञाहृदये, सू० ५) इति चित्तां व्याख्यातम् । तथा च चित्तिशक्तेः प्रथमः संकोचो बुद्ध्यपेक्षयापि सन्निकृष्टतरश्चित्तमिति प्रतीयते । इह तु बुद्धिपर्यायत्वेन चित्तशब्द उपात्तः । एभिश्च बुद्धिवृत्तिभेदैश्चित्तपदवाच्यैः यद् यत्प्राप्यते तत्सर्वं सिद्धिपदेनोच्यते । एता बुद्धिवृत्तयस्तत्फलानि चेत्युभयमपि संसारेऽन्तर्भूतमिति मायारूपमेवात्र निर्दिष्टम् । यद्यपि निरुद्धेन चित्तेन प्राप्तव्यो मोक्षो न मायाया-मन्तर्भावयितुं युक्तः । तथापि स मोक्षश्चरमवृत्त्यैव लभ्यः, ततः पूर्वं निरुद्धेनापि चित्तेन प्राप्या अणिमादिसिद्धयो मायायामेवान्तर्भवन्ति । वृत्तयस्तु सर्वा अपि मय्यन्तर्भूताः सन्त्येवेति बुद्धिः सिद्धिरिति भगवतो गणेशस्य द्वे माये अत्र स्मर्यन्ते । गणपतेश्चापि रूपं जगद्विशिष्टब्रह्मतयैवात्र ख्यापितम् । शिरो

ब्रह्म तदवरमङ्गन्तु जगदित्येकत्रोक्तम् । अपरत्र तु योगरूपेण गणपतिरुक्त इति कायः सविकल्पकसमाधिरूपेण, शिरश्च निर्विकल्पसमाधिरूपेण निर्दिष्टः । यदा गजः शुण्डादण्डं मुखे निवेश्य निमोलितनेत्रो भवति तदा मण्डलाकारं तन्मुखमेकरूपमेव प्रतीयते, न च तत्रावयवभेदः प्रतीयते इति निर्विकल्पकसाम्यं तत्राभिसंहितम् । केवलवेद्यविषयैकाकारैव तत्र वृत्तिर्भवतीत्येकदन्तरूपेण तदेव सूचितम् । काये तु विभिन्ना अवयवा प्रतीयन्त एवेति तस्य संसाररूपता प्रस्फुटैव । चतुर्भिश्च भुजैश्चतुर्दिग्व्याप्तिः सूच्यते । करेषु चिह्नानि च चतुर्विधपुरुषार्थसूचकानि । तत्र पाशोऽर्थरूपः, अर्थरूपेण पाशेनैव जीवानां विशेषतो बन्धनदर्शनात् । मोदकन्तु कामरूपम् तात्कालिकसुखरूपमोदहेतुत्वात् । अंकुशश्च धर्मरूपः नियन्त्रित्वेन धर्मस्याङ्कुशसाजात्येनैव प्रवृत्तिदर्शनात् । अथ कमलं जलस्थितमपि जलेन मनागपि न लिप्यते इति मोक्षरूपं तद्भगवतो हस्ते स्थितम् । एतांश्चतुरोऽपि पुरुषार्थान् यथाधिकारं सेवमानो भगवान् गणपतिः संसारिभ्यो ददातीति त एते तद्ब्रह्मन्मया निर्दिश्यन्ते ।

अस्मिंश्च ग्रन्थे एकैकस्मिन् खण्डे गणपतेः एकैकजामाधिकृत्य तद् व्याख्या विशेषेण दर्शिता, यथा प्रथमखण्डे वक्तुण्डनाम व्याख्या । द्वितीयखण्डे एकदन्तनामव्याख्या, तृतीये लम्बोदरनामव्याख्या, चतुर्थे गजानननामव्याख्या इत्यादि । तत्र तृतीये लम्बोदरपदमित्थं व्याख्यातम्—गणपतेः कायः संसाररूप इत्युक्तं प्राक् । संसारिणाञ्चोदरं दुष्पूरं भवति । बहुतरभोगेऽपि तत्र शान्तरदर्शनात् । अतएव गणपतेः बहुविस्तृतमुदरं मूर्तिषु दृश्यते । ब्रह्मरूपश्च गणपतिः संसारिणामुदरं प्रविश्य भुङ्क्ते ।

अहं वैश्वानरो भूत्वा प्राणिनां देहमाश्रितः ।

प्राणापानसमायुक्तः पचाम्यन्नं चतुर्विधम् ॥

इति भगवद्गीतायां गणपत्यभिन्नेन भगवता कृष्णोपाभिधानात् । तस्मान् परेषामुदरं प्रविश्य भोगकरणादपि तस्य महदुदरं व्याप्यत इति । एवमेव भगवतो गणेशस्य स्वरूपं स्थाने स्थाने निरूपितम् ।

तत्र तत्र कथाभिश्च भगवतो गणेशस्यैव पञ्चसु देवतासु प्राधान्यं स्थापितम् । तथा हि सूर्यमण्डलमभितो निविष्टाः सूर्येण सदैव आगम्यन्तो बालमिव पृथ्वा



सूर्यं पृष्ठवन्तः यत् “सूर्यं आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुषश्च” “नूनं जनाः सूर्येण प्रसूताः” इत्याद्याभिः श्रुतिभिस्त्वमेव सर्वजगत्कारणं सर्वस्यात्मा चाम्नायसे । भवन्तमपि च ध्याननिरतं पश्यामः । तद्भवान् कमभिध्यायतीति नो मनसि जिज्ञासा समुदेति तां कृपया शमय इति ।

तदा सूर्यः “गणपतिरस्माकं सर्वेषामधिष्ठाता” स एव च परं ब्रह्म, तदाज्ञयैव वयं सर्वे तत्तत्कर्मसु प्रवर्तमहे । तमेवाहं सततमभिध्यायामि” इति तान् प्रबोधितवान् । निर्दिष्टवांश्च गणपतितत्त्वं प्रागुक्तम् । भूयश्च तन्माहात्म्यं सुस्पष्टं व्याचक्ष्व कृपयेति पृष्टः सन् स्वीयां कथां कथितवान् यत् कश्यपो मन्मन्त्रं जपन् मां सुचिरमाराधितवान् । तत्तपसा सुप्रसन्नश्चाहं यदा वरं प्रदातुं तत्समीपे गतः तदा स मां बहुतरं स्तुत्वा “त्वमेव मत्पुत्रतां याहि” इति वरं प्रार्थितवान् । अहश्च प्रसन्नस्तस्मै तादृशमेव वरं दत्तवान् । एवमदित्यापि बहुतरं तपस्यन्त्या स एव वरो मत्सकाशाल्लब्धः । विश्वकर्मा च मत्पत्नीं संज्ञानाम्नीं तपसा समाराध्य “त्वं मे पुत्री भूयाः” इति वरं प्रार्थितवान् प्राप्तवांश्च । तथाहं कश्यपाददित्यां द्वादशमी रूपैरवतीर्णः । मत्पत्नी संज्ञा च विश्वकर्मणः पुत्रीत्वमगात् । तथापि विश्वकर्मणा सा मह्यं प्रदत्तेति आवयोः सम्बन्धो जातः । तथा विहरंश्चाहं श्रुतिवाक्यैः स्वमेव सर्वश्रेष्ठतया मन्वानो गणपतिं व्यस्मार्षम् । तदा गणपतिना विघ्नः समुत्पादितः । स चेत्यरूपो यन्माली सुमाली चेति द्वौ आतरौ दैत्यकुले समुत्पन्नौ । ताम्यां च तपसा शिवमाराध्य मत्तोऽप्यधिकप्रकाशं विमानमेकं प्राप्तम् । प्रकाशयन्तौ तौ रात्रिमेव व्यलोपयताम् । दिवा मत्प्रकाशः रात्रौ च तदीयविमान-प्रकाशः इति सदैवैकविधप्रकाशसद्भावाद् रात्रिः केनापि न प्राज्ञायत ।

तदा च प्रातर्मध्याह्नादिकालस्याप्यज्ञानात्तत्कालविहितानि यज्ञादि-कर्मण्यपि विलोपमेव गतानि । अहमेव च यज्ञाहुतिभिराप्यायितो-भवामीति मदाप्यायनमपि यज्ञविलोपान्निवृत्तम् । एवंविधं व्यतिकरमालोक्य मया स्वतेजसा विमानेन सहैव तौ दैत्यावपि दग्धौ । तदा च स्वभक्तानां दाहात्कुपितेन शिवेन त्रिशूलेन मदीयं शिरश्छिन्नम् । तदा सर्वथैव वैदिकानां कर्मणां लोपो जातः । सर्वा अपि च प्रजा मत्सम्बद्धा इति तासामपि विनाश-प्रवर्तितः । तदा च सर्वैर्त्र्यविभिः संभूय भगवान् शिवः प्रार्थितो यत् किमिदं

भवता कृतम् । सूर्यं विना कथं प्रजानां स्थितिः संभवेत् । न चायं प्रलयकाल इत्यकाण्ड एव सर्वप्रलयः कथं भवता प्रारब्ध इति । तदा च शिवेन विचार्योक्तम्— गणपतिना समुत्पादितोऽयं विघ्न इति गणपतिमेवाराध्याहं सूर्यं जीवयिष्यामीति । अनन्तरश्च भगवन्तं गणपतिं प्रसाध्य शिवेनोक्तम्—“यत्सूर्यं जीवय” अन्यथाहमपि स्वकीयं शिरश्छेत्स्यामीति, इत्थं विज्ञापितेन श्रीगणपतिना स्वीयं विघ्नमुपसंहृत्याहं जीवितं प्राप्तिः मदीयं शिरः पुनः कायेन योजितम् । पूर्वं छिन्नं मदीयं शिरश्च काश्यां लोकार्के निपतितमभूत् । तत्रैव चाहं जीवितः । पुनर्जीवितेन च मया चिन्तितं यत् श्रुतिर्मां सर्वस्यात्मानमाह आत्मनश्च कथं मृत्युः संभवेत् । तस्मान्नाहं सर्वस्यात्मेत्येवानुमीयते । न च मया सर्वे जनाः प्रसूताः । तस्माद्व्यर्थं प्रायोऽहमरण्यमेव गत्वा तपश्चरिष्यामीति । अरण्यं गन्तुं प्रवृत्ते च मयि ब्रह्मा समेत्य मां प्रबोधयाश्चकार ।

यच्छ्रुतिः सत्यमेवाह-अवश्यं भवान् सर्वस्य जगतः आत्मा भवतैव च सर्वा अपि प्रजाः पाल्यन्ते । परं सर्वेऽपि वयं ब्रह्माणः शासने तिष्ठामः । तच्छब्दस्या च सर्वे वयं तच्छक्तिमन्तः । स ब्रह्मरूपो भगवान् गणपतिः सर्वैरस्माभिः समुपास्यः सेवनीयश्च । भवता गणपतिस्मरणं विस्मृतमिति तत् एवायं विघ्नः समुत्पन्नः । इदानीं स्वाधिकारं सम्यङ्निर्वाहयता भवता सर्वाधिपतिर्गणपतिः सदा स्मरणीयः सेव्यश्चेति ।

अस्यां कथायामिदं रहस्यं यत् कश्यपो नाम ऋषिरेकः, ऋषयश्च मौलिकाः प्राणाः, सर्वाधिभूता इति श्रुतिषु ख्याप्यते । तदुक्तं शतपथब्राह्मणे— “असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्, तदाहुः किं तदसदासीदित्यूषयो वाव तेऽग्नेऽसदा-सोत्तदाहुः के ते ऋषय इति प्राणा वाव ऋषयः” इति । तेभ्य एव चाग्रे सर्वोत्पत्तिः समाप्ता । भगवता मनुना चाप्युक्तम्—

ऋषिभ्यः पितरो जाताः पितृभ्यो देवदानवाः ।

देवेभ्यश्च जगत्सर्वं चरन् स्थाण्वनुपूर्वशः ॥ इति ।

ततश्च ऋषिभ्य एव पितरो देवाश्च जायन्त इति फलितम् । तत एव च “काश्यपाः सकलाः प्रजाः” इति कश्यपस्य सर्वप्रजानिर्मातृत्वं पुराणादिषु ख्याप्यते । कश्यपश्चायं “कश्यपः पश्यको भवति” इति ब्राह्मणेषु निरुक्तः ।

कूर्मोऽपि च जन्तुविशेषः कश्यप शब्देनाख्यायते । स च यथाज्ञानि संकोचयति विकासयति च, तथैव कश्यपनामा ऋषिरपि स्वाङ्गभूताः प्रजा बहिर्निःसारयति, समये संकोचयति चेति उभयोः सादृश्यम् । कूर्मस्य च पृष्ठभागः सुदृढो भवति, अधोभागश्चातिक्रोमलो भवति । तथैव ब्रह्माण्डस्याप्येको भागः सूर्यातपाग्निष्ठुरो भवति, अपरश्च मृदुरिति ब्रह्माण्डप्रतिकृतिरर्थः कूर्मः ।

तदेतत्सर्वमालोच्याधोमुखोऽत एव सर्वमघःस्थितं पश्यन्निव प्राणविशेषः कश्यप इत्याख्यातः । ऊर्ध्वमघ इति द्वेधा विभक्तस्याकाशस्योर्ध्वभागोऽदितिर्नाम अधोभागश्च दितिर्नाम । ते उभे अपि कश्यपस्य पत्न्यौ समाख्याते । तत्र प्रकाशमाने ऊर्ध्वभागे देवा उत्पद्यन्ते । अन्धकारितेऽधोभागे चासुराः । तदित्थं सर्वदैव घनभूतोऽत एव “चित्रं देवानामुदगादनीकम्” इति श्रुत्या देवानामनीकरूपत्वेनाम्नातः सूर्योऽपि कश्यपाददित्यां जात इति स्पष्टीभवति । स च द्वादशसु-मासेषु पृथग्विधकार्यकरणाद् द्वादशरूप आख्यायते । सूर्यस्योदय एव सर्वेषां प्राणिनां चेष्टाः प्रवर्तन्ते इति चेष्टापरनाम्नी संज्ञा तत्पत्नीत्वेन पुराणेषूक्ता । अन्यत्र पुराणेषु सुरेणुरित्यपि तस्या नाम स्मर्यते सूर्यस्योदयकाले गवाक्षादिषु रेणव इव चलन्तः प्रतीयन्ते याः ( ‘जालसूर्यमरीचिस्थं त्रसरेणूरजस्मृतम्’ ) इत्यादि स्मृतिषु त्रसरेणुत्वेनाख्यायन्ते, एतदेवाभिप्रेत्य सुरेणोरपि सूर्यपत्नीत्वमाख्यातं द्रष्टव्यम् । तस्या अपसरणे च छायानाम्नी परापि स्त्री सूर्यपुराणेषूक्ता । प्रमाया अपसरणे छाया जायते । इति तदभिप्रायोऽपि स्फुटः । सा चेयं विश्वकर्मणः पुत्री इत्याख्याता । अत्र विश्वकर्मणि सर्वकरणशीलं सर्वशक्तिमतं पारमेश्वरमेवैकं रूपं द्रष्टव्यम् । तत एव च सर्वेषां प्राणिनां चेष्टाः प्रादुर्भवन्ति । व्यष्टिभूतानां जीवानां चेष्टायाः समष्टिरूपपरमात्माधीनत्वात् । सूर्यशिरश्छेदस्य चायमभिप्रायो यत् प्रत्येकस्मात्पदार्थाद् ये किरणा बहिर्गच्छन्ति ते सूचीमुखा भवन्ति, ते च मध्ये मध्ये संगत्य पुनस्तिर्यग् गच्छन्ति । तत एव दूरस्थं वस्तु जनैर्लघु प्रतीयते इति “छन्दोवेदनिरूपणे” गुरुवरैः श्री विद्यावाचस्पतिमहोदयैः स्पष्टं व्याख्यातम् । इदमेव श्रुतिषु क्वचिद् गायत्र्याः शिरश्छेदरूपेणान्नायतम् । इह तु सूर्यशिरश्छेदरूपेणैवोक्तम् । किरणानां परस्परं संबन्धेन शिरश्छेद एव सूर्यशिरश्छेदत्वेनोक्तः, सूर्यकिरणानां सूर्याभिन्न-

त्वात् । सर्वं चेदं रुद्ररूपेण वायुना क्रियते इति रुद्ररूपशिवकृतत्वं शिरश्छे-  
दस्योक्तम् । एवंविधैरागतैः किरणैरेव चन्द्रमसो दीप्तिर्जायते, स च रात्रावपि  
प्रकाशते इति रात्रावपि प्रकाशः कथायामुक्तः । सूर्यस्य शिवस्यापि च गणपत्या-  
राधने हेतुस्तु पूर्वं विवृत एव गणपत्याराधकैर्गणपतेरेव परब्रह्मत्वेन विवक्षणा-  
दिति सर्वं यथायथं योज्यम् । काश्यां शिरःपतनादि तु लोलाकर्तृथ-  
महिमस्यापनार्थमेव द्रष्टव्यमिति । अग्रे च मोहस्योत्पत्तिवृत्तान्तं बाल-  
खिल्यैः पृष्टः सूर्यस्तान् बोधयामास — यदेकदा शिवो भगवान् वने एव  
तपश्चरन्नास्ते स्म । तदैव तारकासुरेण स्वस्वस्थानेभ्यः परिभ्रंशिता देवाः  
शिवस्य बोर्यादुत्पन्नेन कुमारेणैव हन्तव्य एष तारकासुर इति विज्ञाय कैलाशे  
पार्वतीसविधे गताः । सर्वञ्च वृत्तान्तं तस्यै न्ववेदयन् । तदा पार्वती भिल्ली-  
रूपं विधाय वने शिवसन्निधौ गता । अतिसुन्दरेण च रूपेण तत्रैव वने पुष्पा-  
वचयादि कुर्वती विचरति स्म । समाधेर्युत्थानकाले च शिवस्तद्रूपं दृष्ट्वा  
मोहितो भूत्वा तां ग्रहीतुमधावत् । सा च ततो दूरीभवन्त्येव ततस्ततो  
विचरति स्म, न तद् हस्तगा बभूव । भूयोभूयस्तद्रूपहणायोत्सुकः शिवस्ता-  
मन्वधावत् । एवमनुधावत एव शिवस्य वीर्यं चस्कन्द । तदेव च वीर्यं  
मोहरूपतामापद्यत । ततश्च परावृत्तेन शङ्करेण ध्यानं कृत्वा पार्वत्येवेयमासीदिति  
प्रत्यभिज्ञातम् । ततश्च स पार्वतीसविधे गत्वा देवानां च प्रार्थनां श्रुत्वा तथा  
सह रन्तुमारेभे । मध्य एव कामस्यापि कथाऽत्र वर्णिता । एवं भिल्ल्यां  
कामवशगेन शङ्करेण क्रोधात्कामो भस्मीकृतः । पश्चाच्च यदा स पार्वतीसमीप-  
माजगाम, तदा कामं सस्मार — “मह्यमङ्गं देहि यत्त्वया भस्मीकृतम्” इति  
तत्प्रार्थितश्च “गणपतिमाराधय स एव तुभ्यमङ्गं दास्यति” इत्युपदिश्य गणपते-  
रेकाक्षरं मन्त्रं तस्मै ददौ । तेन मन्त्रेण समाराधितश्च भगवान् गणपतिः  
प्रत्यक्षीभूय तस्य कानिचित्स्थानानि निर्दिष्टवान् । एवंविधेषु स्थानेषु  
त्वं वसेत्याज्ञापयाञ्चकार । अङ्गन्तु तव विष्णोरवतारभूतेन कृष्णेन  
दास्यते । स एव रुक्मिण्यां त्वामुत्पादयिष्यति । तत्रापि च तवेयं  
रतिरेव भार्या भविष्यतीत्यादिष्टवान् । इत्यादिः कामकथा मध्ये-  
एवात्र वर्णिता । तदनु कर्णिकेशञ्जन्मकथापि प्रकान्ता बहुकालं पार्वत्या  
रममाणोऽपि भगवान् शङ्करो यदा न तृप्तिमगात् तदा देवैः प्रेरितो वह्निर्भिक्षुक-

वेधेण रममाणोस्तयोः प्रदेशं गत्वा दूरस्थित एव भिक्षामयाचत तदा कश्चित् पुरुष आयात इति विज्ञाय पार्वतीपरमेश्वराबुत्थितावभूताम् । उत्थितमात्रस्य च शम्भोः वीर्यं भूमौ चस्कन्द ।

तदादाय च पार्वती भिक्षारूपेण भिक्षुरूपाय बह्वये प्रददौ । बह्विस्तद-  
शित्वा दुर्जरत्वात् तदसहमानश्च गङ्गां गत्वा तत्रोद्ग्रीर्णेण तच्चिक्षेप । तत्र  
स्नानार्थमागताश्च कृत्तिका जलेन सह तत्पुः । ता अप्यसहमानाश्च शरस्तम्भे  
तदुद्गिरन्ति स्म । तत्रैव कुमारो जातः । कृत्तिकाभ्यो जातत्वादयं कार्तिकेय  
उच्यते । शरस्तम्भे च जातत्वात्-शरजन्मा । तं नारदो ददर्श । स च कैलाशं  
गत्वा पार्वतीं प्रति कुमारजन्माख्यातवान् । पार्वती तत्रागत्य तं पयः पाययामास ।  
कृतसंस्कारश्च स सेनापतिर्भूत्वा देवैः सह तारकं हन्तुं जगाम ।  
बहु युध्वापि हन्तुं न शशक । तदा कथं हन्तुं शक्नुयामिति शम्भुं  
पपच्छ । शम्भुनोपदिष्टश्च गणपतिमाराधयाञ्चक्रे । 'आराधितश्च  
गणपतिः प्रत्यक्षीबभूव । कार्तिकेयेन सह बहुधा स्तुतः । अत्रैव स्तुतौ मूषकवाहन-  
स्यापि रहस्यमुक्तम्—यथा मूषकः पृथिव्यां प्रच्छन्न एव निवसति, प्रच्छन्न  
एव च बन्धनानि छिनत्ति, तदा त्वमपि सर्वेष्वन्तर्निगूढो निवससि । अविज्ञात्  
एव भक्तानां बन्धनानि छिनत्सि' इति मूषकवाहनस्त्वमुच्यसे इत्यादि । गणपतिना  
दत्तव्रतश्च स पुनर्देवानां सेनापतिर्भूत्वा युद्धाय यातः तारकासुरं जघान चेति मध्य  
पक्षे तारकासुरकथा पुराणान्तरसंवादिनी कथिता । केवलं गणपतितपश्चरण-  
मेवात्र विशेष उक्तः । अथाग्रे पुनर्मोहचरितमुपक्रान्तम्, शिववीर्यादुत्पन्नो मोहः  
दैत्यगुरुं शुक्रं शरणं गतः । तेनैव तस्य संस्काराः कृताः, सूर्याराधनोपदेशश्च  
दत्तः, तेनाराधितश्च सूर्यस्तस्मै वरान् ददौ, सूर्यात्प्राप्तवरश्च स दैत्यानामधि-  
पतिर्बभूव । प्रमादस्य सुतां मदिराञ्चोपयेमे । तस्यां तस्य उग्रः क्रूरः  
शेषाधी शोचनो हरणश्चेति पञ्चसुता बभूवुः । विषयावास-नगरञ्च सूर्येणास्मै  
दत्तम् । क्रमेणायं सर्वेषां दैत्यानामधिपो भूत्वा स्वसुतान् तत्रतत्राधिपत्ये प्रतिष्ठा-  
पयामास । देवाश्च देवनिष्कायेभ्यो विवास्य तन्निकायेष्वपि स्वाधिकारमेवाकरोत् ।  
अथ देवाः पराजिताः शम्भुसमीपे विष्णुसमीपे च गताः । सर्वे च सम्भूय  
गणपतिमेव शरणं याता । तैः प्रार्थितश्च गणपतिस्तं योद्धुं चलितः । नारदश्च

पुरैव दौत्येन तत्समीपे प्रस्थापयामास । स्वसमीपमागतं नारदमसौ सत्कारेण जग्राह ।  
 “त्वं सर्वत्र विचरसि । लोकस्य धार्ता ूहि”, इति तेन पृष्ठश्च नारदः “गणपतिस्त्वां  
 योद्धुमभियाति, त्वन्नगरात् कियद्दूरे अभिस्थितः । तत्परब्रह्मणा गणपतिना सह  
 तव योधनमनुचितम् । त्वं तं शरणं प्रयाहि” इत्यादि जगौ । तेन पृष्ठश्च  
 गणपतेर्महिमानं तं प्रति व्याख्यातवान् । एवं प्रबोधितश्च मोहासुरो गणपतिं ययौ,  
 तेनाज्ञसश्च देवेभ्यः स्थानानि दत्त्वा दैत्यैः सह पातालं विवेश इति मोहकथासंक्षेपः ।

अथास्याः कथायाः निगूढाभिधायः प्रकटीक्रियते । अन्तरिक्षस्थाने रुद्रः  
 द्वेधा श्रुतौ व्याख्यातः ‘तस्य द्वे तन्वौ घोरास्या च शिवास्या च’ तत्र शिव-  
 तनुर्भगवान् सर्वैरुपास्यते, घोरतनुस्तु मूञ्जवतोऽपि पर्वतात् परतो गन्तुं तत्र  
 तत्र प्रार्थ्यते । तत्रेदं चरितं घोरतनोर्भगवतो रुद्रस्यैव । अतएव तस्य  
 वने विचरणमेवात्र निर्दिष्टम् । अन्येषु पुराणेष्वपि च ब्रह्मणा यदा क्रद्धेन  
 रुद्र उत्पादितः, प्रजाः सृजेति चादिष्टः, यदा तेन स्वसदृशी भयङ्करो प्रजा स्रष्टु-  
 मारब्धा, तदा ब्रह्मणा स्वसृष्टिकरणान्निवर्तितः इति तत्रतत्राख्यायते । एवं  
 विधस्यैव रुद्रस्य वीर्येण मोहोत्पत्तिश्च वर्णिता । मोहस्य च प्रसर आसुरीप्वेव  
 सृष्टिषु भवति, इति असुराचार्यस्यैव समीपे तस्य गमनमुपदिष्टम् । तस्य यादृशः  
 परिवारो वर्णितः तेन त्वल्पबुद्धीनामपि आध्यात्मिकस्यैव मोहस्येयं रूपकविधया  
 कल्पना कृतेति स्पष्टं भासेत । तथाहि प्रमादस्तस्य श्वशुर उक्तः । तत्कन्या च  
 मदिरा मोहस्य पत्नीत्वेनोक्ता । मदिरयैव मोहः प्रवर्तते । मोहेन च  
 मदिरापाने प्रवृत्तिरित्यन्योन्यसाहचर्यात् पत्नीत्वाख्यानं युक्तमेव । सुताश्च तस्य  
 ये उक्ता ते मोहजनितावस्थाविशेषा इव—उग्रत्वं क्रूरत्वञ्च मोहेन मदिरया च  
 जायते । ‘मेघावी’ इति पाठस्तु मोहपुत्रेषु भ्रमजनितोऽशुद्ध ए प्रतीयते, टीका-  
 कृता तु नानाविधविषयस्मरणादसन्मैत्राविशिष्ट इति व्याख्यातम् । अस्मन्मते  
 तु “अमेध्याशी” इति मोहपुत्रेषु गणनं युक्तं प्रतिभाति । मोहेनैव अमेध्याशने  
 प्रवृत्तिदर्शनात् । अन्ते च शोकमेगोत्पादयति मोहः, शोकार्तस्य च तत्तत्पदार्थ-  
 हरणरूपं चौर्यमप्युत्पादयतीति पञ्चैते मोहपुत्राः स्थाने व्याख्याताः ।

तस्य नगरं च विषयावासरूपं यन्निर्दिष्टं तदप्युचितमेव, मोहाक्रान्तानां  
 विषयेष्व्वासक्तिदर्शनात् । प्रवृद्धश्च मोहोऽन्तःकरणे दैवीर्धृतीर्दानधर्मपरोपकाराद्या

उत्सादयतीति देवान् स्वस्थात् प्रचाव्य दैत्यानां तत्र निवेश सम्यगेव प्रतिपादितः । कामक्रोर्धाहसादीनां वृत्तीनामेव मोहेन जननात् । एवंविधानां दैवीनामासुरीणाञ्च वृत्तीनां संघर्ष एव देवासुरयुद्धत्वेन श्रीशङ्कराचार्यैर्व्याख्यात उपनिषद्भाष्ये । एवञ्चिरं मोहराज्ये प्रवृत्ते सत्कर्म परिपाकवशात्पुनरपि दैवीनां वृत्तीनां कदाचिदुदयो भवत्येव । देवैः प्रार्थितश्च ज्ञानरूपो गणपतिर्यदा मोहमाक्रमितुं प्रवृत्तः तदा मोहः स्वयमपसृत इति युक्तमत्र प्रतिपादितम् । पातालगमनञ्च यदसुराणामत्रोक्तम्, तदाधिभौतिकदृष्ट्या, अधिमूतं हि देवानां त्रिलोक्यामावासः असुराणां च पाताले इत्येव पूर्वं ब्रह्मणा व्यवस्था कृतासीत् । तदेतन्मार्कण्डेय-पुराणे सप्तशतीपाठेऽपि देव्या उक्तम्—

त्रैलोक्यमिन्द्रो लभतां देवाः सन्तु हविर्भुजः ।

यूयं प्रयात पातालं यदि जीबितुमिच्छथ ।

इति मोहकथाया आध्यात्मिकं रहस्यम् ।

मध्ये क्रांतिंकेयजन्मकथा च याऽत्रोक्ता तरया अपीदं तात्पर्यमवसेयम्— यद् बह्वी रुद्रवीर्यत्वेनैव तत्र तत्र ख्याप्यते । कृशानुरेता इति रुद्रनामसु क्रोशेष्वपि पठ्यते । अन्तरिक्षस्थो विह्वतो वायुरेव वह्निमुत्पादयति । “अग्नीषोमात्मकं जगदिति” जगन्मूलत्वेन परिभाषितयोरग्नीषोमयोर्मध्ये शुष्क-पदार्थानामग्नित्वेन आर्द्राणां च सोमत्वेन परिभाषणं द्रष्टव्यम् ।

तदेवात्र वह्निपदेनोक्तम् । यद्—‘आक्सिजन’ नाम्ना परिभाषन्ते पाश्चात्या वैज्ञानिकाः, तस्यैव रुद्रवीर्यस्य वह्निना धारणमस्यां कथायामाख्यायते । जलेऽपि च तत्सम्बन्धादेव द्रवत्वमुत्पद्यते इति । जलेऽपि तद्भागरूपेण प्रविष्टं भवतीति वह्निना गङ्गायां तन्न्यसनमत्रोपवर्ण्यते । तारासु च कृत्तिकायां, तत्सम्बन्धः, अतएव कृत्तिका आग्नेयं नक्षत्रं व्याख्यायते ।

अग्रे च सूर्यवंशश्चन्द्रवंशश्चाप्यत्र महापुराणवत् संक्षेपेणोक्तः । तत्र च रामकृष्णयुधिष्ठिरादीनामपि गणपत्युपासनं तत्र तत्र निर्दिष्टम् ।

एवमस्माभिः कृतप्रवचनस्य तृतीयभागस्य सारोऽत्रातिसंक्षेपेण विवृतः । अयं च ग्रन्थो नाद्यावधि कुत्रापि मुद्रितः । लिखितमेव पुस्तकद्वितयमस्माभिः श्रीकेशिरावपुस्तकालयाल्लब्धम् । अस्मिन्स्तु पुराणे योगविषय आगमशास्त्र-विषयश्चापि बहुतरं विवृतो दृश्यते ।

# THE DEVĪ-PURĀṆA, A WORK OF BENGAL

By

R. C. HAZRA

[ 'देवीपुराणं' नामोपपुराणं शाक्तानां प्राचीनतमः परं सम्मानितश्च ग्रन्थः । अयं पुराणग्रन्थो 'बङ्गाल' प्रदेशे रचित आसीदिति लेखेऽस्मिन् डा० हाजरामहोदयेन सप्रमाणं प्रतिपादितम् । एतदर्थं च इमे हेतवोऽत्रोपन्यस्ताः — ( १ ) देवीपुराणस्य प्रायः सर्वे कोशाः (MSS.) बङ्गाक्षरेषु लिखिताः सन्ति, बङ्गदेशे एव च प्राप्यन्ते ; ( २ ) उत्कलदेशीयस्य 'एकान्नपुराणस्य उपपुराणसूच्यां, तथा बङ्ग-देशीयस्य रघुनन्दनकृत 'मलमासतत्त्व' नामकस्य ग्रन्थस्योपपुराणसूच्यामेव च देवीपुराणस्य नाम्न उल्लेखो विद्यते, नाम्यत्र ; ( ३ ) देवीपुराणे बङ्गदेशीयानां कामरूप-कामाख्या-राढ-वर्धमान-प्रभृतीनां स्थानानामुल्लेखो बाहुल्येन प्राप्यते ; ( ४ ) देवीपुराणे शाक्ततीर्थेषु मध्ये वर्धमानमण्डल-स्थितस्य 'उज्जयिनी' नामकस्य स्थानस्य तद्विष्टान्याः 'उज्जनी'ति नाम्न्याः ( वङ्गेषु 'उज्जानी'ति प्रसिद्धायाः ) देवतायाश्च समुल्लेखो वर्तते ; ( ५ ) देवीपुराणे एव दुर्गापूजायां शत्रुबलेर्विधानं प्रथमं प्राप्यते, एषा प्रथा चाधुनाऽपि बङ्गालदेशे प्रचलति ; ( ६ ) देवीपुराणे विन्ध्यवासिन्या देव्याः स्तोत्रं पूजाविधानं च वर्तते, दशकुमारचरिते च सुहृदेषु दामलिशाख्यस्य नगरस्य बाह्योद्याने वर्तमानस्य विन्ध्यवासिन्या आयतनस्योल्लेखो विद्यते, दामलिपत्तं नाम नगरं च बङ्गालदेशस्याधुनिकं 'तामलुक' नामकं स्थानमेव ; ( ७ ) देवीपुराणे अपाणिनीयप्रयोगानां बाहुल्यं विद्यते, एषां च प्रयोगानां बङ्गभाषायाः प्रयोगैः सहातीव साम्यमस्ति । एवम्, देवीपुराणस्य बङ्गालदेशे रचनाऽसूदिति सम्यक् सिध्यति । ]

Among the extant Purāṇic works professing Śaktism, it is the *Devī-Purāṇa*<sup>1</sup> which is decidedly the most ancient as well as valuable and interesting from various points of view. Although this work came to attain an all-India character many centuries ago, being recognised as an authority in religious and social matters by many of the early Smṛti-writers of different parts of

1. Edited and published, with a Bengali translation, by the Vaidya Press, Calcutta. Second edition, 1324 B. S.



India, and the conception of Devī, as found in this work, is in many respects different from that now prevalent in Bengal, there is little scope for doubt that it had its origin in this province. Besides the mention of the names of countries, rivers, holy places etc., mostly belonging to Northern India<sup>2</sup> and showing the relation of this Purāṇa with that part of the country, there are other evidences which point to Bengal as the place of its origin. These evidences may be stated as follows :

(1) Most of the extant manuscripts of the *Devī-p.* are found in Bengal and are written in Bengali script, and those which are now available at or near about Benares, might have been copied from their originals taken there from Bengal. In other parts of India, Mss. of this Purāṇa are very rare.

(2) Of the numerous lists of Upapurāṇas contained in different works it is only those given in the *Ekāmra-purāṇa* (a work of Orissa) and Raghunandana's *Mulamāsa-tattva* (of Bengal) which include the name of the *Devī-p.*<sup>3</sup>

(3) The *Devī-p.* names, in some cases more than once, Kāmarūpa,<sup>4</sup> Kāmākhyā,<sup>5</sup> and the different parts of Bengal, viz , Vaṅga,<sup>6</sup> Rāḍha,<sup>7</sup> Varendra,<sup>8</sup> Samatāṭa,<sup>9</sup> and Vardhamāna,<sup>10</sup> and thus shows its familiarity with and partiality for this part of Eastern India.

(4) Among the few chief holy places sacred to Devī this Purāṇa recognises and names Ujjayinī (a Śākta holy place in the district of Vardhamāna in West Bengal) and its presiding deity Ujjanī (popularly known as Ujānī),<sup>11</sup> which, being of local impor-

2. See *Devī-p.*, chaps. 38, 39, 42, 46 (verses 63 ff.), 63, 74-76, and so on.

3. For these lists see my *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, Vol. I, pp. 4-5 and 13.

4. *Devī-p.* 42. 8 ; 46. 71.

5. *Ibid.*, 39. 6 and 144.

6. *Ibid.*, 46. 69.

7. *Ibid.*, 39. 144.

8. *Ibid.*, 39. 144 ; 42. 9.

9-10. *Ibid.*, 46. 70.

11. See *Ibid.*, 38. 8-उज्जयिन्यां तु उज्जनी जम्बुमार्गे तथा स्थिता ।

tance, are found mentioned only in the works of Bengal.<sup>12</sup>

(5) The *Devī-p.* mentions 'śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā in the following verse:

“तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायाच्छुभ्रं कृत्वा तु पिष्टजम् ।  
खड्गेन घातयित्वा तु दद्यात्स्कन्दविशाखयोः ॥” (22.16)

Curiously enough, this custom survives in Bengal even to the present day.

'Śatru-bali' as a malevolent rite is very ancient. In early days it was performed after pacificatory rites (śānti) by a King's priest with the use of *abhicāra-mantras* for the good of his royal patron. Varāhamihira mentions it in the following verse of his *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* (44. 21):

“शान्तिं राष्ट्रविवृद्धये कृत्वा भूयोऽभिचारकैर्मन्त्रैः ।  
मृण्मयमरिं विभिन्वाच्छूलेनोरःस्थले विप्रः ॥”

“After performing the propitiatory rite for the growth (and prosperity) of the kingdom the (learned) Brahmin (priest) should, by citing *Abhicāra-mantras* again, thoroughly pierce with a lance at its chest (the effigy of) an enemy made of clay.”

12. 'Ujjayinī', mentioned in *Devī-p.* 38. 8 (quoted in the immediately preceding footnote), is the same as the ancient city, popularly known as 'Ujānī', which comprised the modern villages of Kogran, Mangalkot (Sanskrit—**मङ्गलकोटक**) and Āraḥ situated on the bank of the river Ajaya in Katwa sub-division in the district of Burdwan (Vardhamāna) in West Bengal. It has been mentioned, sometimes under its popular name 'Ujānī', in the works of Bengal as one of the Mahāpīṭhas created by the fall of the different parts of Satī's body severed by Viṣṇu, and Devī is said to reside here under the name of 'Ujānī.'

For mention of this sacred city see *Bṛhad-dharma-p.* I. 14. 14, in which Devī says:

“उजयिन्यां तथा पुर्यां पीठं मङ्गलकोटकम् ।  
शुभा मङ्गलवर्णस्याख्या यत्राहं वरदानिनी ॥”

See also *Trikāṇḍasāṭa*, *Tantra-sūdamani*, *Pīṭha-nirṇaya* (*alias Abhicāra-nirṇaya*), *Bhārata-candra's Annadā-maṅgala* (*Pīṭha-mālā*, verse 23), and so on.

For an excellent account of the Śākta Pīṭhas (including the said 'Ujjayinī' or 'Ujānī' of Bengal) see *JASB*, XIV, 1942, pp. 1-104.

But the association of 'śatru-bali' with Durgā-pūjā is of comparatively late date. So far as we have been able to find, it is our *Devī-p.* which is the earliest extant work to mention this rite in connection with Durgā-pūjā. The other comparatively early Purāṇic works to prescribe it are the present *Agnī*<sup>13</sup> and *Garuḍa-purāṇa*, the *Mahābhāgavata* and the *Kālikā-p.* Of these, the *Agnī-p.* (185. 13-14) says in connection with the worship of sixteen- or eighteen- handed Durgā annually on the Mahānavamī Tithi:

“तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायाच्छत्रुं पिष्टमयं हरेत् ।

दद्यात्स्कन्दविशाखाभ्यां ... .. ॥”

“In her (i. e. Devī's) presence the king should take his bath, destroy (the figure of) an enemy made of powdered rice, and give (it) to Skanda and Viśākha ... ..” In much the same words (especially as those of *Devī p.* 22.16) the *Garuḍa-p.* also says in the same connection :

“तस्याग्रतो नृपः स्नायाच्छत्रुं कृत्वा च पैष्टजम् ।

खड्गेन घातयित्वा तु दद्यात्स्कन्दविशाखयोः ॥”<sup>14</sup>

It is to be noted that these two verses of the *Agnī* and the *Garuḍa-p.* (and more particularly that of the latter) agree very much with *Devī-p.* 22.10 quoted above, and have even the incorrect Saṃdhi in 'तस्याग्रतः' (for 'तस्याः वग्रतः') like the *Devī-p.* Moreover, chap. 134 of *Garuḍa-p.* I, which also deals with Durgā-pūjā on the Mahānavamī Tithi, has one line (6b) tallying completely with *Devī-p.* 22, 10a and two more (6a and 7a), agreeing remarkably with *Devī-p.* 22, 9a and 10b respectively. So, there is little doubt about the fact that both the *Agnī* and

13. This is a spurious work available in more printed editions than one and quite different from the genuine *Agneya-p.* still surviving in Mss. under the title *Valmī-p.* For information about this genuine *Agneya-p.* (alias *Valmī-p.*) see my article published in *Our Heritage*, I, 1953, pp. 209-245 and II, 1954, pp. 77-110, and *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, V, 1955-56, pp. 411-416.

14. *Garuḍa-p.* (ed. Vāṅgavāṣī Press, Calcutta), I. 135. 3.

the *Garuḍa-p.* modelled their verses on 'śatru-bali' on that of the *Devī-p.*

Now, the *Agnī-p.* was compiled either in the eastern part of Orissa or in the western part of West Bengal (and most probably in the latter)<sup>15</sup>, and the *Garuḍa-p.* originated in Mithilā, but most likely in that part of Bengal which was adjacent to Mithilā.<sup>16</sup>

Of the *Mahābhāgavata* and the *Kālikā-p.* the former, which mentions the rite of 'śatru-bali' in the verse

“ततः शत्रुं बलिं दद्यात्कृत्वा पिष्टमयं मम ।  
नवम्यां पूजिताहं तु बलिभिर्विविधैरपि ॥” (45.33),

was written in Bengal (most probably in its eastern part) some time during the tenth or eleventh century A. D., and the latter, which gives a description of the rite in chap. 71, verses 177 ff., was compiled in the tenth or the first half of the eleventh century A. D. either in Kāmarūpa or in that part of Bengal which was very near to it.

Again, the earliest Smṛti work to mention the said rite of 'śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā is Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtya-kalpāraṇ* but its only authority is the *Devī-p.*, from which it quotes, in its Rājadharmā-Kāṇḍa, pp. 192-195, verses 3-24 of chap. 22 (including the verse on 'śatru-bali'). In his *Durgotsava paddhati* Udayasiṃha Rūpanārāyaṇa also quotes many verses from the *Devī-p.* and says :

अनन्तरं शत्रुप्रतिमां पिष्टमयीं कृत्वा सङ्ग्रेहं तच्छिरस्येदयित्वा 'ओं स्कन्दाय नमः'  
इति स्कन्दाय शिरो दत्त्वा 'ओं विशाखाय नमः' इति विशाखाय कर्त्तव्यं दद्यात् ॥<sup>17</sup>

Although Udayasiṃha Rūpanārāyaṇa does not quote *Devī-p.* 22. 16 (on 'śatru-bali'), his wordings show definitely that his authority for this rite was the *Devī-p.* In his *Vaidhāna-pārijāta* (II, p. 651) Ananta-bhaṭṭa also quotes the said verse of the

15-16. We shall discuss the questions of provenance of the present *Agnī-* and *Garuḍa-p.* on another occasion.

17. See Asiatic Society (Calcutta) Ms. No. 6415 (Indian Museum Collection), fol. 15b.

*Devī-p.* (and no other authority) in connection with 'śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā.

In Eastern India it is the *Samvatsara-pradīpa* which is the earliest Smṛti work to include this rite in the annual worship of Durgā. It was written in the twelfth century A. D. by Halāyudha, a high state-officer in charge of religious affairs under king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal; and its relevant lines (given without quoting authority) run as follows :

“ततो.....शालिषष्टकशत्रुप्रतिकृतिं निर्माय मण्डपद्वारपार्श्वे उत्तर-  
शिरसं संस्थाप्य लोहितपुष्पेण संपूज्य तोक्षणखड्गम् आदाय अमुकामुक्तं मारया-  
मीति छित्त्वा स्कन्दविशाखाभ्यां नम इति निवेदयेत् ।”<sup>18</sup>

There is also another Smṛti work of Bengal, viz, the *Durgā-pūjā-paddhati* of Vidyābhūṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya, in which there is mention of 'śatru-bali'.<sup>19</sup> Of the Smṛti-writers of Mithilā it is Caṇḍeśvara and Vidyāpati who mention 'śatru-bali' in their *Kṛtya-ratnākara* (pp. 353, 360) and *Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī* (pp. 35, 197) respectively, the authority cited by them on this rite being the *Devī-p.* only. The influence of the Bengal Nibandhas on the sections on Durgā-pūjā in Caṇḍeśvara's *Kṛtya-ratnākara* and Vidyāpati's *Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī* is obvious. It is specially remarkable that in all cases the non-Bengal Nibandhas use the *Devī-p.* as their only authority on 'śatru-bali', that all the Purāṇas, except the *Devī*, which mention this rite, connecting it with Durgā-pūjā, belong either to Bengal or to places very near to it, and that this rite is found to be followed in some form or other in Bengal even at the present day. From all this it appears that both the rite of 'śatru-bali' in Durgā-pūjā and the *Devī-p.* recording it originated in Eastern India and very likely in Bengal.

(6) Although the *Devī-p.* mentions 'Kāmarūpa' and 'Kāmākhya' as places of Devī-worship, it does not add any importance to these, nor does it betray any influence of the method of Devī-worship followed in these places. On the other hand, it concerns itself with the praise and worship of Vindhyavāsīnī (of whom,

18. See Dacca University Ms. No. 4632, fol. 25b.

19. See Dacca University Ms. No. 2258 (dated Śaka 1658), fols. 46b.-47b.

as the *Daśakumāra-carita* tells us, there was a famous temple at 'Dāmalīpta' or Tamluk,<sup>20</sup> and the importance of Kāmarūpa as a place of Śakti-worship and its influence on Bengal became more and more prominent in the later Purāṇic works such as the *Kalikā-p.*, *Mahābhāgavata* and *Bṛhad-dharma-p.*

(7) Unlike all other works of the Purāṇic literature, the *Devī-p.* is written in highly incorrect Sanskrit which compares very favourably with the language of the *Mahāvastu*, *Lalitavistara* and other Buddhist Sanskrit works of East Indian origin.<sup>21</sup> So, there can be little doubt about the fact that the *Devī-p.* also had its origin in Eastern India.

(8) In the *Devī-p.* there are many words and expressions which are clearly based on those in popular use in Bengal. As instances, only a few are noted below.

(a) The inflected form 'devyā' of 'devī' has been used in a large number of places as a basic word and declined like 'lātā' and other feminine words ending in 'ā'. (It should be mentioned here that in rural Bengal the word 'devyā' for 'devī' is popularly used as a surname of Brahmin words even at the present day). Similarly, 'mātā', 'dubhitā', 'trātā', 'hotā' etc. have been used on several occasions as basic words respectively for 'mātr', 'dubitr', 'trātr', 'hotr' etc.

(b) As in Bengali, the word 'sammata' has been used to mean 'the person who has agreed or given his consent' (and not 'the matter agreed upon or consented to') in *Devī-p.* 7. 96—एवं ताः संमतीकृत्वा.....। निमुक्ताः शंभुना.....॥ (Cf. Bengali—'सम्मत करिया').

(c) Like the word 'Ki' used for 'Kim vā' in Bengali, the *Devī-p.* uses 'Kim' in 8. 12—.....द्वारे.....। नारदस्तिष्ठते देव स्थाप्यतां किं प्रवेक्ष्यताम् ॥

20. See *Daśa-Kumara-Carita* (ed. M. R. Kalc, Bombay), p. 149—

.....सुहोषु दामलिप्ताङ्गयस्य नगरस्य बाह्योद्याने.....आयतने  
विस्मृतकिन्धिरागवासं वसन्त्या विन्ध्यवासिण्याः .....।

21. The results of my studies in the language of the *Devī-p.* are going to be published very soon.

Cf. Bengali—देव, ... द्वारे .... नारद अवस्थान करितेछेन, [तांहाके सेखानेइ] राखिते हइवे कि प्रवेश कराइते हइवे ? (Note the word 'स्याप्यताम्' for Bengali 'राखिते हइवे').

(d) The verbal forms 'uttha' (for 'uttiṣṭha') in *Devī-p.* 8. 17 (उत्थ राजन् महाबाहो ....) and 'karanti' (for 'kurvanti') in *Devī-p.* 35. 27 ( ... बाधां करन्ति च ) are very similar to their Bengali equivalents 'उठ' (rise) and 'करे' (present tense, third person, plural number of the Bengali root 'करा' for Sanskrit 'कृ').

(e) As in Bengali, the Sanskrit root 'bhuj' (meaning 'to enjoy') has been used in the form 'bhujī' in many places of the *Devī-p.* see, for instance, *Devī-p.* 2. 42 ( स्वर्गभूषस्तपोतालान् भुञ्ज त्वं .... ), 2. 49, 5. 16 ( भुञ्ज स्वर्गम् ), 4. 10 ( भूपातालानि भुञ्ज ), 9. 12 ( भुञ्जते पृथ्वीम् ), 9. 36 ( बाला भुञ्जतीया ), 9. 39 ( भुञ्जन् पृथ्वीम् ), and so on.

(f) On numerous occasions nouns derived from verbal roots by means of Kṛt affixes denoting action have been allowed to govern objects having the second case-ending. For instances of such use we may refer to *Devī-p.* 1. 57 (श्रवणात् .... पुराणं शिव-भाषितम्, in which the word 'श्रवण' governs the Accusative Case in 'पुराण'), 8. 57 (कन्यामुद्बह्नोपरि—about marrying the girl), 9. 42 (तामुद्बहसमुत्सुकः—eager to marry her), 9. 50 (विद्या मोहनशीला या ससुरा-सुरमानवान्), 11. 22 (दिवमुत्सहते जये), 13. 22 (अस्थीनि दर्शनम्), and so on. Similar use of Kṛdanta nouns denoting action is very common in Bengali and has its root in the Vedic literature, in which there are a few instances, viz., *Rg-veda* viii. 11.7—अन्ते त्वांकामया गिरा (which Śāyaṇācārya explains as 'त्वांकामया त्वाम् अभिलषन्त्या गिरा स्तुत्या'), *Atharva-veda* vi. 139. 2, 4—मां कामेन ... —by loving me (Whitney), *Satapatha-brāhmaṇa* ii. 3. 1. 16—यद्येनं क्षीरं केवलं पानेऽभ्यामवेत्—if it should happen to him to have to drink pure milk (Eggeling), and so on.

(g) 'ज्वलन्त' (for 'ज्वलत्') has been used as a basic word in *Devī-p.* 14. 27—ज्वलन्तकोपा. Cf. Bengali—'ज्वलन्त अगुन'—blazing fire, 'चलन्त गाडी'—moving car, 'घुमन्त शिशु'—sleeping child, and so on,

(h) As in Bengali, the word 'पूर्वे' (with the seventh case-ending) has been used in *Devī-p.* 6. ii. 1 (मया पूर्वे च त्वं देव उक्तमासीत्) in the sense of 'formerly'.

(i) In several places of the *Devī-p.* the seventh case-ending has been used in place of the fourth in the Dative Case. See for instance, *Devī-p.* 11. 7-11 (वसिष्ठेनापि सा दत्ता .... सारस्वते ; बहुभुजस्ता-  
रुणे ददौ, 'तारुणे' being used for 'ताम् भारुणे'; and so on), 106. 5 (देव्या भक्तो प्रदातव्यम्).

Cf. Bengali— "बाप दिला हेन बरे — (my) father gave me to such a bridegroom..... ; सत्पात्रे दान करा उचित — (one) should make gifts to a good recipient ; and so on.

(j) As in Bengali, words have sometimes been used in different cases without any case-ending at all. See, for instance, *Devī-p.* 3. 12, 21 (महासंप्रान चक्रिरे), 14. 20 ( " वामं भुज पूरयित्वा " भावति कुक्ष कोपात्), 14. 25 (तथापि कालो गदा तां मुमोच), 14. 27 (एवं स कालो हत भैरवश्च..... ), and so on.

From the evidences adduced above it is clear that the *Devī-p.* was an East Indian work originating in Bengal. The use of the simile of ships (पोत) in more places than one in this Purāṇa<sup>22</sup> tends to show that it was written somewhere about Tamruk, where, as we have already seen from the *Dāśa-kumāra-carita*, there was a famous temple of Vindhyavāsini and whence ships were sent to distant countries outside India.

22. *Devī-p.* 72-73 ( 'पोती पोतस्य वा यथा' used in connection with the maintenance of a fort by its owner); 77. 2 ( " शिबपोतं तु तेन शरं भवार्जवात् ); 83.112 ( देव्यौघमज्जमानानां त्वं पोता भव शुक्लिनी ).



## श्रीवराहपुराणं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायश्च

पं. के० वि० नीलमेषाचार्यः

[The learned writer has here discussed the relation of the *Varāha-Purāṇa* and the *Rāmānuja-Sect* of Vaiṣṇavism. The *Varāha-Purāṇa* has been the principal *Purāṇa* of the *Rāmānuja-Sect*, and so it has been profusely drawn upon in the works of this *Sect*.

The writer has shown that many of the important religious and philosophical tenets of the *Rāmānuja-Sect* are contained in the *Varāha-Purāṇa*. He traces in the present *Varāha-Purāṇa* a number of the *Ślokas* quoted by *Rāmānuja* and *Vedānta-deśika* in their works. Still, there are many *ślokas* found in the works of the *Rāmānuja-Sect*, which are mentioned as quoted from the *Varāha-Purāṇa*, but which are not actually traceable in the available editions of this *Purāṇa*. Such *ślokas*, in the opinion of the writer, either might have been lost from the *Varāha-Purāṇa* or might be traced in the Southern Mss. of this *Purāṇa*, which have not yet been utilised for preparing its editions.

The learned writer has also discussed the question whether the *Varāha-Purāṇa* was ever composed or redacted by the followers of the *Rāmānuja-Sect*. He says that the Sanskrit-works of the *Rāmānuja-Sect* (which are called the *Sāḍasya-granthas*) are meant to propagate the doctrines of this sect among the scholars of the opposite fold also, and so they mainly draw upon the works which are recognised by both the parties. And as these *Sāḍasya-granthas* have mainly drawn upon the *Varāha-Purāṇa*, this *Purāṇa*, therefore, could not be

confined to the Rāmānuja-Sect only. Again, this Purāṇa contains several statements and doctrines which are opposed to those of the Rāmānuja-Sect; e. g., the doctrines of unity or identity of the three Gods of the Trinity and performance of *sakāma* karmas, both preached by the Varāha-Purāṇa, are opposed to the main doctrines of the Rāmānuja-Sect which preaches the doctrine of superiority of God Viṣṇu over Brahmā and Rudra both, and abhors the performance of *sakāma* karmas. All this shows that the Varāha-Purāṇa was not composed or even redacted by the followers of the Rāmānuja-Sect, but had been composed by sages like Vyāsa long before the inception of this Sect.]

अष्टादशसु पुराणेषु श्रीवराहपुराणं द्वादशं गण्यते । तथा च श्रीविष्णुपुराणे तृतीयेऽंशे षष्ठेऽध्याये वचनं “वाराहं द्वादशं चैव” इति । इदं सात्त्विकपुराणेष्वन्यतमम् । तथा च षड्पुराणवचनं—

“वैष्णवं नारदीयं च तथा भागवतं शुभम् ।  
गारुडं च तथा पाद्मं वाराहं शुभदर्शने ।  
सात्त्विकानि पुराणानि विज्ञेयानि शुभानि वै ॥” इति ।

नारदीये वराहपुराणविषये वर्ण्यते

“शृणु पुत्र प्रवक्ष्यामि वाराहं वै पुराणकम् ।  
भागद्वययुतं शश्वद्विष्णुमाहात्म्यसूचकम् ॥”  
“मानवस्य तु कल्पस्य प्रसङ्गं मत्कृतं पुरा ।  
निबबन्ध पुराणेऽस्मिन् चतुर्विंशत्सहस्रके ॥” इति ।

एतद्वचनवर्णितानि भागद्वययुतविष्णुमाहात्म्यसूचकत्वमानवकल्पवृत्तवर्णनाधिष्ठातृत्वरूपाणि वराहपुराणस्य लक्ष्माणि एतल्लेखे आकरप्रदर्शनाद्यर्थं परिगृहीते कल्कितातासंस्कृतकालेनाध्यापकेन श्रीहृषीकेशशास्त्रिणा संशोध्य प्रकाशितेऽस्मिन् वराहपुराणग्रन्थे संघटन्ते । परं तु अनेन वचनेन श्रीमद्भागवते द्वादशस्कन्धेऽन्तिमेऽध्याये विद्यमानेन “चतुर्विंशति वाराहम्” इति वचनेन च ज्ञापिता

चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रात्मिका ग्रन्थसंख्या सांप्रतिकेऽस्मिन् बराहपुराणे नोपलभ्यते, किं तु द्वादशसहस्रात्मिकैव ग्रन्थसंख्योपलभ्यते । तेनावधार्यते प्राचीनस्य बराहपुराणस्यार्धभाग एव सांप्रतमुपलभ्यते, अर्धभागो लुप्त इति । अथवा यत इदं बराहपुराणं श्रीहृषीकेशशास्त्रिलिखितभूमिकानुसारेण उत्तरदेशीयलिखितपुस्तकत्रयमवलम्ब्यैव संशोध्य प्रकाशतां नीतम्, दक्षिणादिदेशीयलिखितपुस्तकानि संशोधनकर्मणि न जगृहिरे अत एव पूर्णशरीरं बराहपुराणं न संलक्ष्यते । दक्षिणादिदेशस्थलिखितप्राचीनपुस्तकान्यप्यवलम्ब्य तत्रत्याध्याययोजनपूर्वकं यदि बराहपुराणं मुद्रायेत तर्हि बराहपुराणस्य प्रायश्चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रसंख्याकग्रन्थपरिमिततापि संभाव्यते । दक्षिणदेशस्थैः श्रीवैष्णवसंप्रदायाचार्यैराकरनिर्देशपूर्वकमुद्धृतानां श्रीबराहपुराणवचनानां बह्वनामस्मिन् बराहपुराणग्रन्थेऽनुपलम्भोऽपीमां संभावनामुपोद्बल्यति । किंचास्मिन् बराहपुराणे पुराणेष्ववश्यवर्णनीयत्वेनादृतेषु सर्गादिषु पञ्चसु अर्थेषु केषांचिद्वर्णनं च यद् दृश्यते तेनापि पुराणस्यापूर्णता स्फुटीभवति । अस्मिन् पुराणे स्रष्टृप्रकारः आद्धमहिमा तदनुष्ठानप्रक्रिया प्रथमादितिषु तत्तद्देवताराधनं प्रतिष्ठादशि विष्णुपूजनप्रकारभेदो नानातीर्थमहिमा वर्णाश्रमधर्माः पापफलनानाश्रमभयप्रकारो नानादानमहिमा देवताराधकनानाभक्तचरितानीत्यादयोऽर्थाः प्रतिपाद्यन्ते । बाहुल्येन श्रीविष्णुमाहात्म्यं वैष्णवधर्माश्च वर्ण्यन्ते । इमेऽर्थाः सर्वेषां सनातनधर्मानुयायिनां संप्रतिपन्नाः । वैष्णवसंप्रदायानुयायिनस्तु सुतरामेतानर्थान् संप्रतिपद्यन्ते ।

अथ श्रीबराहपुराणं रामानुजसंप्रदायं चाधिकृत्य विचार्यते किमनयोर्गाढसम्बन्धोऽस्ति नवेति । तदर्थमिदं विमृश्यते श्रीबराहपुराणोदिताः के के प्रधानार्थाः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियन्ते ? श्रीबराहपुराणस्थानि कानि वचनानि श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिषु ग्रन्थेषु प्रमाणत्वेनोद्धृतानि ? तेषु कियन्ति अस्मिन् कलिकातामुद्रिते बराहपुराणे समुपलभ्यन्ते कियन्ति च नेति ? अनुपलम्भस्य को हेतुः ? श्रीबराहपुराणस्य श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायाचार्यैरतिशयेनाद्रियमाणत्वे किं निबन्धनम् ? किमिदं पुराणं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिः प्राचीनैराचार्यैर्निर्मितं परिवर्धितं वेति शक्यशङ्कमुत नेति ?

अथ श्रीबराहपुराणोदिताः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीकृता अर्थाः स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन संगृह्यन्ते ।

(१) नारायणस्य जगत्कारणत्वप्रतिपादनपरया “एको ह वै नारायण आसीत् न ब्रह्मा नेशानो नापो नाग्नीषोमौ नेमे द्यावापृथिवी न नक्षत्राणि न सूर्यो न चन्द्रमाः, स एकाकी न रमेत” इत्यादिकथा महोपनिषदा प्रतिपादितं श्रीवराहपुराणस्यैः

“पूर्वं नारायणस्त्वेको नासीत् किञ्चिद् धरे परम् ।

सैक एव रतिं लेभे नैव स्वच्छन्दकर्मकृत् ॥” (अ० ९, श्लो० २)

“ससर्ज सर्वभूतानि यथा नारायणात्मकः ।

कथ्यमानं मया देवि तदशेषं क्षिते शृणु ॥” (अ० २, श्लो० २२)

“आपो नारा इति प्रोक्ता आपो वै नरसूनवः ।

अयनं तस्य ताः पूर्वं तेन नारायणः स्मृतः ॥” (अ० २, श्लो० ३६)

“सर्वे देवाः सपितरो ब्रह्माद्याश्चाण्डमध्यगाः ।

विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूता इतोयं वैदिकी श्रुतिः ॥” (अ० १७, श्लो० २३)

“यदेतत्परमं ब्रह्म वेदवादिषु पठ्यते ।

स देवः पुण्डरीकाक्षः स्वयं नारायणो हरिः ॥” (अ० ३९, श्लो० १५)

“नारायणात्परो देवो न भूतो न भविष्यति ।

एतद्ब्रह्मस्य वेदानां पुराणानां च सर्वशः ॥” (अ० ३, श्लो० ५०)

इत्येभिर्बचनैरुपबृंह्यमाणं नारायणस्य जगत्कारणत्वं परब्रह्मरूपत्वं च श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते । अत्र स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयेशितृत्वं “नारायण त्वयि न मृष्यति वैदिकः कः” इति स्तोत्ररत्नपद्यं श्रीरामानुजगीताभाष्या-वतरणिकास्थः “परंब्रह्म पुरुषोत्तमो नारायणः” इति व्यपदेशश्च निदर्शनम् । अत्रोदाहृतम् “आपो नारा इति प्रोक्ताः” इति वचनं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायाचार्येण श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकेन विरचिते रहस्यत्रयसारे मूलमन्त्राधिकारे समुद्धृतमवलोक्यते । इदं वचनं मनुस्मृतावप्युपलभ्यते । “सर्वे देवाः सपितरः” इति वाराहवचनं श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकविरचिते स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयेशितृत्वम्” इति पद्यस्य व्याख्यायां समुद्धृतं दृश्यते । “यदेतत्परमं ब्रह्म” इति वाराहवचनं तस्मिन्नेव स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “तत्त्वेन यः” इति पद्यस्य व्याख्यायां समुद्धृतं संलक्ष्यते । “नारायणः परो देवः” इति वाराहवचनं स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “कस्योदरे” इति श्लोकस्य व्याख्यायामुदाहृतमध्यक्ष्यते ।

## (२) श्रीवराहपुराणे—

“सृष्ट्वा नारस्ता अथो तत्र चाहं येनैव स्यान्नाम नारायणेति ।

कल्पे कल्पे तत्र शयामि भूयः सुप्तस्य मे नाभिजः स्याद्यथाद्य ॥

“एवंभूतस्य मे देवि नाभिपद्मे चतुर्मुखः ।

उत्तस्थौ स मया प्रोक्तः प्रजाः सृज महामते ॥” (अ० २, श्लोक १२, १३)

इति वचनाभ्यां प्रतिपादिता नारायणाच्चतुर्मुखस्य ब्रह्मण उत्पत्तिः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायेऽभ्युपगम्यते । अत्र “परं ब्रह्म पुरुषोत्तमो नारायणो ब्रह्मादि-  
स्थावरान्तं जगत्सृष्ट्वा” इति श्रीरामानुजगीताभाष्यावतरणिकास्थं वाक्यं निदर्शनम् ।  
श्रीरामानुजविरचिते श्रीभाष्याभिधे ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्ये इदं वचनद्वयं “तथाऽऽदि  
सर्गमहं वक्ष्ये” इत्यारभ्योच्यते—

“सृष्ट्वा नारं तोयमन्तःस्थितोऽहं येन स्यान्मे नाम नारायणेति ।

कल्पे कल्पे तत्र शयामि भूयः सुप्तस्य मे नाभिजं स्याद्यथाब्जम् ॥”

“एवं भूतस्य मे देवि नाभिपद्मे चतुर्मुखः ।

उत्पन्नः स मया चोक्तः प्रजाः सृज महामते ॥”

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ ईषत्पाठभेदेन समुद्धृतं संलक्ष्यते । श्रीभाष्योदाहृतः  
पाठः समीचीन इति परामर्शो कियमाणे विज्ञायते । अस्यां पङ्क्तौ उद्धृतम्  
“आदिसर्गमहं वक्ष्ये” इति वचनं वराहपुराणे “आदिसर्गमहं तावत्कथयामि  
वरानने” (अ० २, श्लोक ५) इत्येवमवलोक्यते । श्रीभाष्ये देवताधिकरणे तथा  
“परो नारायणो देवस्तस्माद्यातश्चतुर्मुखः” इत्यस्मिन् वाक्ये उद्धृतमिदं वचनमपि  
वराहपुराणान्तर्गतमेव । इदं वचनं वराहपुराणे—

“परो नारायणो देवस्तस्माज्जातश्चतुर्मुखः ।

तस्माद्बुद्धोऽभवद्देवि स च सर्वज्ञतां गतः ॥” (अ० ९०, श्लो० ३)  
इत्येवं संलक्ष्यते ॥

## (३) श्रीवराहपुराणे—

“परो नारायणो देवस्तस्माज्जातश्चतुर्मुखः ।

तस्माद्बुद्धोऽभवद्देवि स च सर्वज्ञतां गतः ॥” (अ० ९०, श्लो० ३)

“आद्यो नारायणो देवस्तस्माद् ब्रह्मा ततो भवः ।

अतः स्वयंभुवश्चान्ये मरीच्याद्यार्कसंभवाः ॥” (अ० २५, श्लो० ६)

इत्याभ्यां वचनाभ्यां प्रतिपादिता ब्रह्मणो रुद्रादिसृष्टिः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते । तत्र “परो नारायणो देवः” इति वचनं स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “कस्योदरे” इति श्लोकग्राह्यायां समुद्धृतमवलोक्यते । “आद्यो नारायणो देवः” इति वचनं रहस्यत्रयसारे परदेवतापारमार्थ्याधिकारे उद्धृतं संलक्ष्यते ॥

(४) श्रीवाराहे सप्ततितमेऽध्यायेऽगस्त्यरुद्रसंवादस्थैः

“क एषां भवतां याज्यो वरिष्ठश्च नृपोत्तम ।

एवमुक्ते तदोवाच रुद्रो मां सुरसन्निधौ ॥ ११ ॥

रुद्र उवाच—

शृण्वन्तु विबुधाः सर्वे तथा देवर्षयोऽमलाः ।

ब्रह्मर्षयश्च विख्याताः सर्वे शृण्वन्तु मे वचः ॥

त्वं चागस्त्य महाबुद्धे शृणु मे गदतो वचः ॥ १२ ॥

यो यज्ञैरिज्यते देवो यस्मात्सर्वमिदं जगत् ।

उत्पन्नं सर्वदा यस्मिन् लीनं भवति सामरम् ।

नारायणः परो देवः सर्वरूपो जगदर्दनः ॥ १३, १४ ॥

त्रिधाऽऽत्मानं स भगवान् ससर्ज परमेश्वरः ।

रजस्तमोभ्यां युक्तोऽभृद्वज्रसत्त्वाधिकं विभुः ॥ १५ ॥

ससर्ज नाभिकमलाद् ब्रह्माणं कमलासनम् ।

रजसा तमसा युक्तः सोऽपि मामसृजद्विभुः ॥ १६ ॥

यत् सत्त्वं स हरिर्देवो यो हरिस्तत् परं पदम् ।

ये सत्त्वरजसी सोऽपि ब्रह्मा कमलसंभवः ॥ १७ ॥

यो ब्रह्मा सैव देवस्तु यो देवः स चतुर्मुखः ।

यद्वजस्तमसोपेतं सोऽहं नास्त्यत्र संशयः ॥ १८ ॥

सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चैव त्रितयं चैतदुच्यते ।

सत्त्वेन मुच्यते जन्तुः सत्त्वं नारायणात्मकम् ॥ १९ ॥

रजसा सत्त्वयुक्तेन भवेत्सृष्टी रजोऽधिका ।

तच्च पैतामहं स्थानं सर्वशास्त्रेषु पठ्यते ॥ २० ॥

यद् वेदबाह्यं कर्म स्याच्छास्त्रमुद्दिश्य सेव्यते ।  
 तद्वैद्रीमिति विख्यातं तन्नेष्टं गदितं नृणाम् ॥ २१ ॥  
 यद्वा न रजसा कर्म केवलं तामसं तु यत् ।  
 तद्गुणतिपरं नृणामिहलोके परत्र च ॥ २२ ॥  
 सत्त्वेन मुच्यते जन्तुः सत्त्वं नारायणात्मकम् ॥ २३ ॥

इत्येभिर्वचनैः प्रतिपाद्यमानं ब्रह्मविष्णुरुद्राणां राजससात्त्विकतामसत्  
 नारायणस्य सर्वदेवश्रेष्ठत्वं नारायणोपासनस्यैव मोक्षहेतुत्वं ब्रह्मरुद्रोपासनस्य सांसारिक  
 फलपर्यवसायित्वं च श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायेऽभ्युपगम्यते । श्रीवराहपुराणस्थेष्वेषु  
 वचनेषु बहूनि वचनानि श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेष्वीषत्पाठभेदेन समुद्धृतानि  
 दृश्यन्ते । तथाहि—स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “कः श्रीः श्रियः” इति पद्यव्याख्याय  
 पुराणे च वाराहे अगस्त्यरुद्रसंवादे रुद्रः —

यत् सत्त्वं स हरिर्देवो यो हरिस्तत् परं पदम् ।  
 सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चेति त्रितयं चैतदुच्यते ॥  
 सत्त्वेन मुच्यते जन्तुः सत्त्वं नारायणात्मकम् ।  
 रजसा सत्त्वयुक्तेन भवेच्छ्रीमान्यशोऽधिकः ।  
 तच्च पैतामहं स्थानं सर्वशास्त्रेषु पठ्यते ॥  
 यद्वेदबाह्यं कर्म स्यान्मामुद्दिश्योपसेव्यते ।  
 तद्वैद्रीमिति विख्यातं कनिष्ठगतिदं नृणाम् ॥  
 यद्वीनतपसा युक्तं केवलं तामसं तु तत् ।  
 तद्गुणतिप्रदं नृणामिहलोके परत्र च ॥

इत्यस्यां षड्क्तौ “यत् सत्त्वम्” इत्यादीनि वचनानि समुद्धृतानि । तथेमानि  
 वचनानि पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायामभ्युद्धृतानि । एवं स्तोत्रभाष्ये “कस्योदरे”  
 इति पद्यव्याख्यायां “श्रीवाराहे चागस्त्यं प्रति रुद्रः —

नारायणः परो देवः सत्त्वरूपी जनार्दनः ।  
 त्रिधात्मानं स भगवान् ससर्ज परमेश्वरः ॥  
 रजस्तमोभ्यां युक्तोऽमृद्रजस्सत्त्वाधिकं विभुम् ।  
 ससर्ज नाभीकमले ब्रह्माणं कमलासनम् ॥  
 रजसा तमसायुक्तं सोऽपि मामसृजत्प्रभुः ॥” इति ।

अत्र त्रिधाऽऽत्मानमित्येतत् स्वेन रूपेण क्षेत्रज्ञद्वयविशिष्टरूपेण चेति बहु-  
प्रमाणानुसारेण मन्तव्यम् । रजस्तमोयोगश्च तद्गुणकद्रव्याधिष्ठातृत्वेन भवति ॥  
इत्यस्यां षड्क्तौ “नारायणः परो देवः” इत्यादीनि वचनानि उद्धृतानि । अत्र-  
मवधेयम्, अत्र स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “त्रिधात्मानम्” इत्यस्य क्लृष्टगत्या निर्वर्णद्विजने  
श्रीवाराहे तथाविधा अप्यर्थाः प्रतिपाद्यन्ते ये श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायस्य प्रतिकूल इति ॥

(५) श्रीवाराहे दशमेऽध्याये—

“चन्द्रादित्यौ वसवो ये च साध्या विश्वेधिनौ महत्क्षोष्मपाश्च ।

सर्वे भवन्तं शरणं गताः स्म कुरुष्व पूज्यानिह विश्वमूर्ते” ॥ ७ ॥

इति देवप्रार्थितेन नारायणेन तेषां यागादावाराध्यत्वं वरत्वेन विभीषणिद्वये  
रामानुजसंप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते । अयं श्लोकः स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “कम्प्योदेर” इति  
पञ्चव्याख्यायासुद्धृतः । “स्मः” इति तत्र पाठः ।

(६) श्रीवाराहे त्रयस्सप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

“चतुर्मुखो वा यदि कोटिवक्त्रो भवेन्नरः कोऽपि विशुद्धचेताः ।

स मे गुणानामयुतैरनेकैर्वदेत् तदा देववर प्रसीद ॥” ३४ ॥

इत्यादिभिर्वचनैः प्रतिपाद्यमानं श्रीविष्णोरनन्तकल्याणगुणपूर्णत्वं श्रीरामानुज-  
संप्रदाये स्वीक्रियते । अयं श्लोकः स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “यद्वाश्रमावधि” इति श्लोक-  
व्याख्यायां वाराहे च रुद्रगीतासु सप्तमाध्याये—

“चतुर्मुखायुर्यदि कोटिवक्त्रो भवेन्नरः क्वापि विशुद्धचेताः ।

स ते गुणानामयुतैकमंशं वदेन्न वा देववर प्रसीद ॥” इति

इत्यस्यां षड्क्तौ समीचीनपाठमेवेन सहोद्धृतं लक्ष्यते ।

(७) श्रीवराहपुराणे पञ्चमेऽध्याये—

“बृहस्पते कर्मिणा किं प्राप्यते ज्ञानिनाऽथवा ।

मोक्ष एतं ममाचक्ष्व पृच्छतः संशयं प्रभो” ॥ १६ ॥

इति रैभ्यपृष्टस्य बृहस्पतेर्व्याधिभिः संवाद्मन्त्रेण प्रवृत्तैः—

“यत् किंचित्कुरुते कर्म पुरुषः साध्वसाधु वा ।

सर्वं नारायणे न्यस्य कुर्वन्नपि न लिप्यते ॥ १७ ॥



परमात्मा स्वयंग्रतैः क्रीडते भगवान् स्वयम् ॥ २३ ॥

अहंभावः सदा ब्रह्मत्रविधेयो मुमुक्षुभिः ॥ २४ ॥

एवं ज्ञानं भवेत्कर्म कुर्वतोऽपि स्वजातिकम् ।

भवेन्मुक्तिर्द्विजश्रेष्ठ रैभ्य राजवसो ध्रुवम्' ॥ ४३ ॥

इत्येभिः कर्मज्ञानपरैर्वचनैः श्रीवराहपुराणे चतुर्थेऽध्याये “कथमाराधयेद्देवं हरिं नारायणं परम्” ॥ १७ ॥ इति राज्ञाऽश्वशिरसा पृष्ठाभ्यां जैगीषव्यकपिलाभ्या-  
मुत्तरत्वेनोक्तैः—

“किंतु सर्वशरीरस्थः परमात्मा जगत्पतिः ।

स्वदेहे दृश्यते भक्त्या नैकस्थानगतस्तु सः ॥ ३७ ॥

एवं सर्वगतो विष्णुस्तव देहे जनेश्वर ।

मन्त्रिणां भृत्यसंघस्य सुराद्या ये प्रदर्शिताः ॥ ३९ ॥

पशवः क्रीटसंघाश्च तेऽपि विष्णुमया नृप ।

भावनां तु दृढां कुर्याद्यतः सर्वमयो हरिः ॥ ४० ॥

नान्यत् तत्सदृशं भूतमितिभावेन सेव्यताम् ।

एष ते ज्ञानसद्भावस्तव राजन् प्रकीर्तितः ॥ ४१ ॥

परिपूर्णं भावेन स्मर नारायणं गुरुम् ।

पूजोपहारैर्धूपैश्च ब्राह्मणातां च तर्पणैः ॥

ध्यानेन सुस्थितेनाशु सुप्राप्यः परमेश्वरः ॥ ४२ ॥

इत्येभिर्वचनैः, सप्तत्रिंशेऽध्याये—

“भावसाध्योऽस्म्यहं देवि न वित्तैर्न जपैरहम्” ॥ २ ॥ इति,

पञ्चदशाधिकशततमेऽध्याये—

“नाहं दानसहस्रेण नाहं यज्ञशतैरपि ।

तुष्ट्यामि न तु वित्तेन ये नराः स्वल्पचेतसः ॥ ३ ॥

एकचित्तं समाधाय यो मां जानाति माधवि ।

नित्यं तुष्ट्यामि तस्याहं पुरुषं बहुदोषकम्” ॥ ४ ॥ इति,

द्वाचत्वारिंशदधिकशततमेऽध्याये—

“तस्माच्चित्तं समादाय मां प्रपद्यस्व मेदिनि ।

न्यस्य ज्ञानं च योगं च एकचित्ता भजस्व माम् ॥२७॥

मच्चित्तः सततं यो मां भजेत नियतव्रतः ।

सत्पार्श्वं प्राप्य परमं मद्भावायोपपद्यते” ॥२८॥

इति भगवतो वराहस्य वचनैश्च प्रतिपाद्यमानः कर्मज्ञानभक्तीनां मोक्षसाधनत्व-  
प्रकारो गीताभाष्यं रचयद्भिस्तदारंभे “ज्ञानकर्मानुगृहीतं भक्तियोगमवतारयामास” इति  
भाषमाणैः श्रीरामानुजाचार्यैरुररीक्रियत इति गीताभाष्यपरिशीलिनां सुगमम् ॥ एवं सृष्टि-  
प्रकारो भुवनकोशप्रकारः श्राद्धमहिमा श्राद्धानुष्ठानप्रक्रिया श्राद्धवर्ज्यानि प्रथमादि-  
तिथिषु तत्तद्देवताराधनप्रकारः प्रतिद्वादशि विष्णुपूजनप्रक्रिया, विविधा दानधर्माः  
वर्णाश्रमधर्माः नानाधातुभिर्भगवत्प्रतिमानिर्माणपूर्वकं तत्प्रतिष्ठापनाराधनयोः प्रकाराः  
पाञ्चरात्रतन्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं प्रतिष्ठाराधनादौ संप्राप्तता पाशुपतागमस्याप्रामाण्याप्राप्तते  
नानातीर्थमहिमा ब्राह्मरौद्रवैष्णवशक्तिमहिमा नरकयातनानुभवप्रकारस्तत्तद्धर्मनिष्ठ-  
विविधमहापुरुषचरितानीत्यादयस्ते ते वराहपुराणवर्णिता अर्थाः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये-  
ऽङ्गीक्रियन्ते इत्यलं विस्तरेण ।

(९) रहस्यत्रयसारोऽर्थपञ्चकाधिकारे भगवद्विग्रहस्याप्राकृतत्वप्रतिपादना-  
वसरे समुद्घृतं “न तस्य प्राकृता मूर्तिर्मांसमेदोऽस्थिसंभवा ।” इति वचनं  
श्रीवराहपुराणे पञ्चसप्ततितमेऽध्याये एकचत्वारिंशदधिकशततमेऽध्याये

(१०) रहस्यत्रयसारपुरुषार्थकाष्ठाधिकारे समुद्घृतं—

“तस्य यज्ञवराहस्य विष्णोरमिततेजसः ।

प्रणामं येऽपि कुर्वन्ति तेषामपि नमोनमः ॥”

इति वचनं श्रीवराहपुराणे एकादशद्विंशततमेऽध्याये

“तस्य यज्ञवराहस्य विष्णोरमिततेजसः ।

प्रणामं ये च कुर्वन्ति ते पूज्याः सततं सुरैः ॥८३॥

इत्येवमीषत्पाठमेवेनोपलभ्यते ।

(११) रहस्यत्रयसारे साध्योपासनशोधनाधिकारे “नमो नारायणेत्युक्त्वा श्वपाकः पुनरागमत्” इति सामि समुद्भूतं व्याख्यातुमिः—

“ततः प्रभाते विमले विनिवृत्ते च जागरे ।

नमो नारायणेत्युक्त्वा श्वपाकः पुनरागमत् ॥”

इति कात्स्न्येनोदाहृतं श्रीवाराहवचनं श्रीवाराहपुराणे १३९ तमेऽध्याये

“अथ प्रभाते विमले गीते नृत्ये च जागरे ।

नमोनारायणायेति श्वपाकः परिवर्तते” ॥५३॥

इत्येवं पाठभेदेन संलक्ष्यते ।

(१२) श्रीवाराहपुराणे द्वाविंशत्यधिकशततमेऽध्याये विद्यमानम्—

“अहं शिष्या च दासी च भक्त्या च त्वयि माधव ॥११॥

इत्येतद्धरणीवाक्यं श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकविरचिते रहस्यशिखामणौ समुद्भूतं प्रेक्ष्यते ।

(१३) श्रीवाराहपुराणे सप्ततितमेऽध्याये वर्तमानं

“त्वं च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ।

अल्पायासं दर्शयित्वा मोहयाशु महेश्वर” ॥३६॥

इतीदं वचनं श्रीरहस्यत्रयसारे परदेवतापारमार्थ्याधिकारे

“त्वं हि रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ।

दर्शयित्वाल्पायासं फलं शीघ्रं प्रदर्शय ॥”

इति पाठभेदेनोद्भूतं संदृश्यते ॥

(१४) श्रीभाष्यश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां पशुपत्यधिकरणे “तथाष्टषष्टितमेऽध्याये-

“पौरुषं सूक्तमास्थाय ये यजन्ति द्विजास्तु माम् ।

संहितान्पमास्थाय ये मां प्राप्स्यन्ति ब्राह्मणाः ॥

अलभे वेदमन्त्राणां पञ्चरात्रोदितेन हि ।

मार्गेण मां प्रपद्यन्ते ते मां प्राप्स्यन्ति मानवाः ॥

ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविशां पञ्चरात्रं विधीयते ।

शूद्रादीनां न तत् स्तोत्रपदवीमुपयास्यति ॥

एवं मयोक्तं विप्रेन्द्र पुराकल्पे पुरातनम् ।  
 पञ्चरात्रं सहस्राणां यदि कश्चिद्ग्रहीष्यति ॥  
 कर्मक्षये च मां कश्चिद्यदि भक्तो भजिष्यति ।  
 तस्य वेदाः पञ्चरात्रं नित्यं हृदि वसिष्यति ॥  
 वेदेन पञ्चरात्रेण भक्त्या यज्ञेन च द्विजाः ।  
 प्राप्योऽहं नान्यथा प्राप्यो वर्षलक्षैरपि द्विजाः ॥”

इति पञ्चरात्रस्य वेदतुल्यविकल्पभाजत्वानुगुणं प्रामाण्यमभिहितम् । तथा  
 पाशुपतनिष्ठानां तन्त्रान्तरनिष्ठानामिव भगवच्छास्त्रपराङ्मुखत्वं तामस्युगानुवर्तित्वं  
 च तत्रोक्तम्—

“इतरे राजसैर्भावैस्तामसैश्च समावृताः ।  
 भविष्यन्ति द्विजश्रेष्ठ मच्छासनपराङ्मुखाः ॥  
 कृतं त्रेताद्वापरं च युगानि त्रीणि नारद ।  
 सत्त्वस्था मां समेष्यन्ति कलौ रजस्तमोऽधिकाः ॥”

इत्याद्यास्तु पंक्तिषु समुद्धृतानि वचनाचि श्रीवराहपुराणे षट्षष्टितमेऽध्याये

“पौरुषं सूक्तमास्थाय ये यजन्ति द्विजास्तु माम् ।  
 ते मां प्राप्स्यन्ति सततं संहिताध्ययनेन च ॥१०॥  
 अलाभे वेदमन्त्राणां पञ्चरात्रोदितेन हि ।  
 मार्गेण मां यजन्ते ये ते मां प्राप्स्यन्ति मानवाः ॥११॥  
 ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविशां पञ्चरात्रं विधीयते ।  
 शूद्रादीनां तु मे क्षेत्रपदवीगमनं द्विज ॥  
 मन्त्राम विहितं तेषां नान्यपूजादिकं चरेत् ॥१२॥  
 एवं मयोक्तं विप्रेन्द्र पुराकल्पे पुरातनम् ।  
 पञ्चरात्रं सहस्राणां यदि कश्चिद्ग्रहीष्यति ॥१३॥  
 कर्मक्षये च मां कश्चिद् यदि भक्तो भविष्यति ।  
 तस्य चेदं पञ्चरात्रं नित्यं हृदि वसिष्यति ॥१४॥  
 इतरे राजसैर्भावैस्तामसैश्च समावृताः ।  
 भविष्यन्ति द्विजश्रेष्ठ मच्छासनपराङ्मुखाः ॥१५॥

कृतं त्रेता द्वापरं च युगानि त्रीणि नारद ।  
 सत्त्वस्था मां समेष्यन्ति कलौ रजस्तमोऽधिकाः ॥ १६ ॥  
 अन्यच्च ते वरं दन्नि शृणु नारद सांप्रतम् ।  
 यदिदं पञ्चरात्रं मे शास्त्रं परमदुर्लभम् ॥  
 तद्भवान् वेत्स्यते सर्वं मत्प्रसादान्न संशयः ॥ १७ ॥  
 वेदेन पञ्चरात्रेण भक्त्या यज्ञेन च द्विज ।  
 प्राप्योऽहं नान्यया वत्स वर्षकोऽथ्ययुतैरपि ॥ १८ ॥

इत्येवं पाठभेदेनोपलभ्यन्ते ॥

(१५) श्रीभाष्यपाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां “किं च तत्र रुद्रवचः—  
 देवदेव जनःसर्वो मुक्तिमार्गव्यवस्थितः ।  
 कथं सृष्टिः प्रभविता नरकेषु च को वसेत् ॥  
 एवमुक्तस्तदा देवैर्मासुवाच जनार्दनः ।  
 युगानि त्रीणि सहसा मासुपेक्ष्यन्ति मानवाः ॥  
 अन्त्ये युगे प्रविरला भविष्यन्ति मदाश्रयाः ॥  
 एष मोहं सृजाम्याशु यो जनं मोहयिष्यति ।  
 त्वं च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ॥  
 अरुपायासं दर्शयित्वा फलं शीघ्रं प्रदर्शय ।  
 कुहकानीन्द्रजालानि विरुद्धाचरणानि च ॥  
 दर्शयित्वा जनं सर्वं मोहयाशु महेश्वर ।  
 एवमुक्तस्तदा तेन देवेन परमेष्ठिना ॥  
 आत्मा तु गोपितः सद्यः प्रकाशोऽहं कृतस्ततः ॥  
 तस्मादारभ्य कालात्तु मत्प्रणीतेषु सत्तम ।  
 शास्त्रेष्वभिरतो लोको बाहुल्येन न वेद तम् ॥

इत्यस्मिन् वाक्ये बराहपुराणस्थत्वेनोद्धृतानि वचनानि श्रीबराहपुराणे  
 समतितमेऽध्याये—

“देवदेव जनः सर्वो मुक्तिमार्गे व्यवस्थितः ।  
 कथं सृष्टिश्च भविता नरकेषु च को वसेत् ॥ ३३ ॥

एवमुक्तस्ततो देवो मामुवाच जनार्दनः ।  
 युगानि त्रीणि बहवो मामुपेप्यन्ति मानवाः ॥३४॥  
 अन्त्ये युगे प्रविरला भविष्यन्ति मदाश्रयाः ।  
 एष मोहं सृजाम्याशु यो जनं मोहयिष्यति ॥३५॥  
 त्वं च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय ।  
 अल्पायासं दर्शयित्वा मोहयाशु महेश्वर ॥३६॥  
 एवमुक्तस्तदा तेन देवेन परमेष्ठिना ।  
 आत्मा तु गोपितस्सद्यः प्रकाशोऽहंकृतस्तदा ॥३७॥  
 तस्मादारभ्य कालात्तु मत्प्रणीतेषु सत्तम ।  
 शास्त्रेष्वभिरतो लोको बाहुल्येन भवेदतः ॥३८॥”  
 इत्येवमुपलभ्यन्ते ॥

- (१६) पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां—“यथाद्विसप्ततितमे  
 “मां विष्णोर्व्यतिरिक्तं ये ब्रह्माणं च द्विजोत्तमाः ।  
 यजन्ति पापकर्माणस्ते यान्ति नरकं नराः ॥  
 ये वादमार्गनिर्मुक्तास्तेषां मोहार्थमेव च ।  
 नयसिद्धान्तसंज्ञं हि मया शास्त्रं तु दर्शितम् ॥  
 पाशोऽयं पशुभावस्तु स यदा पतितो भवेत् ।  
 तदा पाशुपतं शास्त्रं जायते वेदसंज्ञितम्” ॥ इति”

इत्येवं वराहपुराणस्थत्वेन वर्णितानि वचनानि वराहपुराणे सप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

“मां विष्णोर्व्यतिरिक्तं ये ब्रह्माणं च द्विजोत्तम ।  
 भजन्ते पापकर्माणस्ते यान्ति नरकं नराः ॥४०॥  
 ये वादमार्गनिर्मुक्तास्तेषां मोहार्थमेव च ।  
 नयसिद्धान्तसंज्ञाभिर्मया शास्त्रं तु दर्शितम् ॥४१॥  
 पाशोऽयं पशुभावस्तु स यदा पतितो भवेत् ।  
 तदा पाशुपतं शास्त्रं जायते वेदसंज्ञितम्” ॥४२॥

इत्येवं समुपलभ्यन्ते ॥

(१७) तस्यामेव पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां—“यथा त्रिसप्ततितमे  
“मोहनार्थं तु भूतानां त्वया शास्त्रं पृथक् कृतम् ।  
तत् कदा हेतुना केन कृतं देव वदस्व नः” ॥

इत्युदाहृतं वचनं वराहपुराणे एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये नवमश्लोकत्वेन दृश्यते ॥

(१८) तस्यामेव श्रुतप्रकाशिकायां तदनन्तरं “दुर्मिक्षाद् गौतमेन रक्षितैरनु-  
मतैर्जिगमिषुभिर्मुनिभिर्गौतमातिसंधानमुक्त्वाऽभिहितम्—

“एवमुक्तस्तदा तैस्तु गौतमः किमिदं त्विति ।  
गोवध्याकारणं मुञ्चंस्तावत्पश्यति योगवित् ॥  
ऋषीणां मायया सर्वमिदं जातं विचिन्त्य वै ।  
शशाप ताँस्तदा भस्ममिथ्याभूतधराँस्तथा ॥  
भविष्यथ त्रयीबाह्या वेदकर्मबहिष्कृताः ।  
तच्छ्रुत्वा क्रूरवचनं गौतमस्य महामुनेः ॥  
ऊचुः सप्तर्षयो मैवं सर्वकालं द्विजोत्तमाः ।  
भवन्तु किं तु ते वाक्यममोघं नात्र संशयः ॥  
त्वद्वाक्यवह्निर्दग्धाः सदा कलियुगे द्विजाः ।  
भविष्यन्ति क्रियाहीनास्सर्ववेदबहिष्कृताः ॥”

इति गौतमशपं तल्लघूकरणाय कलौ जन्म तदनुग्रहाय तद्गोत्रप्रवर्तकैर्महि-  
श्वरस्याभ्यर्थनं चोक्त्वा” इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणीयत्वेनोद्धृतानीमामि वचनानि  
श्रीवराहपुराणे एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

“एवमुक्तस्तदा तैस्तु गौतमः किमिदं त्विति ।  
गोवध्याकारणं मुञ्चं तावत् पश्यति गौतमः ॥ ३८ ॥  
ऋषीणां मायया सर्वमिदं जातं विचिन्त्य वै ।  
शशाप तान् जटाभस्ममिथ्याव्रतधराँस्तथा ।  
भविष्यथ त्रयीबाह्यावेदमार्गबहिष्कृताः ॥ ३९ ॥

तच्छ्रुत्वा क्रूरवचनं गौतमस्य महामुनेः ।  
ऊचुः सप्तर्षयो मैवं सर्वकालं द्विजोत्तम ॥४०॥

एवं तु किंतु ते वाक्यं मोघं नास्त्यत्र संशयः ।  
यदि नाम कलौ सर्वे भविष्यन्ति द्विजोत्तमाः ॥४१॥

उपकारिणि एते हि अपकर्तार एव तु ।  
इत्थं भूता अपि कलौ भक्तिभावो भवन्तु ते ॥४२॥

त्वद्वाक्यवद्भिर्निर्दग्धाः सदा कलियुगे द्विजाः ।  
भविष्यन्ति क्रियाहीना वेदमार्गबहिष्कृताः ॥४३॥

इत्येवं संहस्यन्ते ।

(१९) पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां तत्र यथा महेश्वरवचः—

“एवमभ्यर्थितस्तैस्तु पुराऽहं द्विजसत्तम ।  
वेदक्रियासमायुक्तां कृतवानस्मि संहिताम् ॥

निश्वासाख्यां ततस्तस्यां लीना ब्राह्मव्यशाण्डिल्यः ।  
अल्पापराधा इत्येव शेषा बैडालिकाभवन् ॥

मयैव मोहितास्ते हि भविष्यज्जानता द्विजाः ॥” इति तत्र—

“निश्वाससंहितायां हि लक्षमात्रा प्रमाणतः ।  
सैव पाशुपती दीक्षा योगः पाशुपतश्च सः ॥

एतस्माद्वेदमार्गाद्धि यदन्यविह जायते ।  
तच्छ्रूय कर्म विज्ञेयं रौद्रं शौचविगर्हितम् ॥

ये रुद्रमुपजीवन्ति कलौ बैडालिका नराः ।  
उच्छिष्टरुद्रास्ते ज्ञेया नाहं तेषु व्यवस्थितः ॥”

इति, तथा “तेषां गौतमशापाद्धि भविष्यन्त्यन्वये द्विजाः” इति प्रकृत्य

“तेषां मध्ये सदाचारा ये ते मच्छ्रमस्ते रताः ।

ते स्वर्गमपवर्गं च यान्त्येव खल्वेति निश्चयः ॥



बैडालिका ये यास्यन्ति मम सन्ततिदूषकाः ।  
 प्राग्गौतमाग्निनिर्दग्धाः पुनर्मद्वचनाद् द्विजाः ॥  
 नरकं ते गमिष्यन्ति नात्र कार्या विचारणा ॥”

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्त्यदुद्धृतानि वचनानि वराहपुराणे एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

“एवमभ्यर्थितस्तैस्तु पुराहं द्विजसत्तम ।  
 वेदक्रियासमायुक्तां कृतवानस्मि संहिताम् ॥५०॥

निश्वासाख्यां ततस्तस्यां लीना ब्राह्मव्यशाण्डिलाः ।  
 अल्पापराधं श्रुत्वैव गतास्ते दाम्भिका भवन् ॥५१॥

मयैव मोहितास्ते तु भविष्यज्जानता द्विजाः ।  
 लौल्यार्थिनः स्वशास्त्राणि करिष्यन्ति कलौ नराः ॥५२॥

निश्वाससंहिताया हि लक्षमात्रं प्रमाणतः ।  
 सैव पाशुपती दीक्षा योगः पशुपतेस्तथा ॥५३॥

एतस्माद्वेदमार्गाद्धि यदन्यदिह जायते ।  
 तत् क्षुद्रकर्म विज्ञेयं रौद्रं शौचविवर्जितम् ॥५४॥

ये रुद्रमुपजीवन्ति कलौ वैदान्तिका नराः ।  
 लौल्यार्थिनः स्वशास्त्राणि करिष्यन्ति कलौ नराः ॥

उच्छृष्मरुद्रास्ते ज्ञेया नाहं तेषु व्यवस्थितः ॥५५॥ इति,

“तेषां गौतमशापाद्धि भविष्यन्त्यन्वये द्विजाः” ॥५६॥ इति,

“तेषां मच्छासनरताः सदाचाराश्चये द्विजाः ।

स्वर्गं चैवापवर्गं च इत्युक्त्वा संशयात् पुरा ।

वेदान्तिकाऽथो यास्यन्ति मम सन्ततिदूषकाः ॥५९॥

प्राग् गौतमाग्निना दग्धा पुनर्मद्वचनाद् द्विजाः ।

नरकं तु गमिष्यन्ति नात्र कार्या विचारणा ॥६०॥”

इत्येवमीक्ष्याठमेदेन संलक्ष्यन्ते ।

(२०) पाञ्चरात्ररक्षायाम् “अत्र चाकर्मण्यतद्देतूनपराधानेवमाह भगवान्—  
 “शृणु सुन्दरि तत्त्वेन आहारस्य विनिर्णयम्” इत्यारभ्योपात्ता श्लोकानां सप्तत्रिंशत्

वराहपुराणे सप्तदशधिकशततमेऽध्याये ईषत् पाठमेदंनोपलभ्यन्ते ॥ १०० ॥  
श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषु तत्र तत्र प्रमाणत्वेनोद्धृतानि वचनानि सांप्रतिके वराहपुराणे  
कलिकातानगरमुद्रिते वराहपुराणे आकरनिर्देशपूर्वकमुदाहृतानि ।

अथ श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषु तत्र तत्र वराहपुराणीयत्वेन प्रमाणत्वेन  
उद्धृतानि यानि वचनानि सांप्रतिके वराहपुराणे नोपलभ्यन्ते, तान्मुदाहरिष्यन्ते ।

(१) पाशुपताधिकरणश्रुतप्रकाशिकायां तत्राप्युद्धृतमे—

“विष्णुरूपेण याज्योऽहं सर्वदेवैर्द्विजोत्तम ।

सात्त्विकी सा समाख्याता वृत्तिर्मे सुनिपुणव ॥

जटामकुटधारी च नागभूतैः समानृतः ।

सिद्धान्तनयमार्गस्थैरहं रुद्रेति पूजितः ।

राजसीं मे तु तां वृत्तिं जानीहि द्विजसत्तम ॥”

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणीयत्वेनोदाहृतानि वचनानि सांप्रतिके वराहपुराणे  
कुत्रापि नोपलभ्यन्ते ।

(२) तत्रैव श्रुतप्रकाशिकायां समनन्तरमुद्धृतं—

“तथार्हद्भुद्धभिक्षूणां वैडालव्रतिकैरहम् ।

तमोऽतिरिक्तैर्यष्टव्यस्ताँस्तमस्येव पातये ॥”

इति समुद्धृतं वराहपुराणवचनमपि अस्मिन् वराहपुराणे न लभ्यते ।

(३) श्रीकृष्णपादस्वामिभिः स्वीयरहस्यग्रन्थे श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकैः रहस्यग्रन्थे-  
मणिनाम्नि रहस्यग्रन्थे च श्रीवराहपुराणचरमश्लोकेत्वेनोद्धृतस्य व्याख्यातैः अन्वय-  
रहस्यग्रन्थेषु बहुश उद्धृतप्रतीकौ—

“स्थिते मनसि सुस्थिते शरीरे सति यो नमः ।

धातुसाम्ये स्थिते स्मर्ता विश्वरूपं च मामब्रवीत् ॥

ततस्तं त्रियमार्णं तु काष्ठपापापसन्निभम् ।

अहं स्मरामि मद्भक्तं नयामि परमां गतिम् ॥”

इत्येतौ श्लोकौ कलिकातामुद्रितेऽस्मिन् वराहपुराणे न लभ्यते ।

(४) श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकैर्विरचितायां सच्चरित्ररक्षायां प्रथमेऽधिकारे श्रीवराहे—

“वासुदेवाङ्कनं कुर्यादात्मनो बाहुमूलयोः ।

सोऽश्वमेधफलं प्राप्य विष्णुलोके महीयते ॥ इति;

तत्रैव क्षेत्रसाहास्ये—

“मच्चक्राङ्कितदेहो यो मद्भक्तो भुवि दुर्लभ ।

मामेवैष्यति धर्मात्मा मदेकान्तेन चेतसा ॥

चक्राङ्कितमुनाः केचिद्यत्र कुत्र वसन्ति वै ।

योजनानि तथा त्रीणि मम क्षेत्रं वसुन्धरे ॥

ये केचिद्यत्र पुरुषा विष्णुचक्राङ्कमुद्रिताः ।

तेषां दर्शनमात्रेण महापातकनाशनम् ॥

भूतप्रेतपिशाचाश्च ङाकिन्यश्च वसुन्धरे ।

तत् सर्वं प्रशमं याति यत्र चक्राङ्कितो वसेत्” ॥

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणस्थत्वेनोद्धृताः श्लोका अस्मिन् वराहपुराणपुस्तके कुत्रापि न दृश्यन्ते ।

(५) सच्चरित्ररक्षायां द्वितीयेऽधिकारे तत्रैव क्षेत्रमाहात्म्याभिधानभागे—

“कुलीनो ब्राह्मणो विद्वान् भस्मधारी भवेद्यदि ।

वर्जयेत्तादृशं देवि मद्योच्छिष्टघटं यथा ॥”

इत्यस्यां पङ्क्तौ वराहपुराणीयत्वेनोद्धृतः श्लोकोऽस्मिन्वराहपुराणे न दृश्यते ।

(६) सच्चरित्ररक्षायां द्वितीयाधिकारे सन्ति च पुराणादिष्वपि तथात्वे वचांसि । तथाहि श्रीवराहे—

“एकान्तिनो महाभागा मत्स्वरूपविदोऽमलाः ।

सान्तरालान् प्रकुर्वीरन् पुण्ड्रान् मम पदाङ्गुलीन् ॥

रक्षार्थं मङ्गलार्थं च पवित्रार्थं वरानने ।

मन्त्रमुच्चार्य विधिवद्भारयेदूर्ध्वपुण्ड्रकम्” ॥

इत्यत्रोद्धृतौ श्लोकौ बराहपुराणे न लक्ष्येते ।

(७) 'श्रीवेदान्तदेशिकविरचितायां पाञ्चरात्ररक्षायां तृतीयेऽधिकारे "भगवन्मन्दिरे च तत्तच्छास्त्रोक्तानपचारान् परिहरेत् । एवं तु श्रीबराहपुराणे द्वात्रिंशदपचाराः पठिताः" इत्युक्त्वा धरणीबराहसंवादरूपं चतुश्चत्वारिंशच्छ्लोकात्मकमेकमध्यायं विलिख्य "इति श्रीबराहपुराणे धरणीप्रदने द्वात्रिंशदपचारो नाम पञ्चचत्वारिंशोऽध्यायः" इत्युल्लिख्योपसंहृतम् । परन्त्वयमध्यायो बराहपुराणे पूर्वोत्तरभागयोः कुत्रापि नोपलभ्यते किं तु बराहपुराणे ऊनाशीत्यधिकशततमेऽध्यायेऽष्टभिः श्लोकैरन्यथैव त्रयस्त्रिंशदपचाराः पठिताः संलक्ष्यन्ते ।

(८) तत्रैव पाञ्चरात्ररक्षायां समनन्तरमुद्धृतं रहस्यत्रयसारे प्रभावव्यवस्थाधिकारे चोद्धृतं—

प्रमादादपि कीलालं यः स्पृशेद्वैष्णवो नरः ।

उपचारशतेनापि न क्षमामि वसुन्धरे ॥”

इति वचनं कल्किातानगरमुद्रिते बराहपुराणे कुत्रापि नोपलभ्यते ।

(९) स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “जनित्वाऽहं वंशे” इति श्लोकव्याख्याने—

“लब्ध्वा तु मानुषं देहं पञ्चभूतसमन्वितम् ।

मामेव न प्रपद्यन्ते ततो दुःखतरं नु किम् ॥”

इति बराहपुराणीयत्वेनोद्धृतः श्लोको बराहपुराणे नोपलभ्यते । अनेन श्लोकेन बराहपुराणे षोडशाधिकशततमेऽध्याये भाव्यं तत्र तथाविधश्लोकानां बहूनां दर्शनात् । परंतु तत्रायं नोपलभ्यते । इत्थमन्वेष्टेण कृते श्रीबराहपुराणीयत्वेन श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषुद्धृतानि सांप्रतं कल्किातानगरमुद्रिते बराहपुराणेऽनुपलभ्यमानानि बहूनि वचनान्युदाहर्तुं शक्यन्ते । परंतु अत्र विस्तरभयाद्विरम्यते ।

अत्रायं प्रश्न उन्मिश्रति एषमनुपलम्बस्य को हेतुः ? अत्रोत्तरमुक्तपूर्वं यत् कल्किातानगरे हृषीकेशशास्त्रिणा संशोध्य संपादितमिदं बराहपुराणमुत्तरदेशीयानां त्रयाणां लिखितग्रन्थानां सहाय्येनैव मुद्रितम्, न तु दक्षिणदेशीयानां ग्रन्थानामवलम्बनेन । दक्षिणात्यबराहपुराणग्रन्थे एषां श्लोकानां पाठः संभाव्यते । किं च,

अन्यान्यपुराणेषु चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रसंख्याकग्रन्थमितत्वेन वराहपुराणे वर्ण्यमाने सांप्रतिकमुपलभ्यमानस्य द्वादशसहस्रग्रन्थमितस्य वराहपुराणस्य दर्शनेन अवशिष्ट दशसहस्रग्रन्थलोपोऽनुमीयते । यदि विभिन्नदेशेषूपलभ्यमानान् लिखितवराहपुराण-ग्रन्थानवलम्ब्य सर्वपरामर्शपूर्वकं यदि वराहपुराणं संशोध्येत प्रकाश्येत, तर्हि-बहूनामध्यायानामाधिक्यं ध्रुवं फलेदित्यत्र न सन्देहः ॥

अथ विमृश्यते श्रीवराहपुराणस्य रामानुजसंप्रदायाचार्यैरतिशयेनाद्रियमाणत्वे किं बीजम् ? इति तत्रेदं परिस्फुरति यत्—

“वैष्णवं नारदीयं च तथा भागवतं शुभम् ।

गारुडं च तथा पाद्मं वाराहं शुभदर्शने ।

सात्त्विकानि पुराणानि विज्ञेयानि शुभानि वै ॥”

इति पाद्मवचनानुरोधेन वराहपुराणस्य विष्णुपुराणवत् सात्त्विकत्वात् विष्णुपुराणापेक्षयातिशयेन वैष्णवधर्मप्रतिपादकत्वाच्च वाराहपुराणं श्रीवैष्णवाचार्यै राजसतामसपुराणापेक्षयाऽतिशयेनाद्रियत इति । वराहपुराणापेक्षया श्रीवैष्णव-संप्रदाये विष्णुपुराणस्यैवादरणं समधिकं दृश्यते, यतस्तत्पुराणवचनान्येव बहुश-उदाहृत्य श्रीभाष्यादिषु श्रीरामानुजाचार्यप्रभृतिभिः स्वमतस्थापनं क्रियते ।

अथ विचार्यते श्रीवराहपुराणवचनानां श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिस्तत्र तत्र बहुश उदाहरणादिदं पुराणं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिः प्राचीनैराचार्यैर्निर्मितं परिवर्धितं वेति शक्यशङ्कमुत नेति । तत्रेदं प्रतिभाति श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये द्विविधा ग्रन्थाः पूर्वाचार्यैर्निर्मिताः सन्ति रहस्यग्रन्थाः सदस्यग्रन्थाश्चेति । तत्र रहस्यग्रन्थाः शिष्याणामुपदेशार्थं निर्मिताः तेषु परवादिभिः प्रमाणग्रन्थत्वेनानभिमतानां श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये प्रमाणत्वेन स्वीकृतानां दिव्यसूरिगाथानामपि प्रमाणत्वेनोपन्यासो भवति । सदस्यग्रन्थेषु श्रीभाष्यादिषु संस्कृतभाषामयेषु ग्रन्थेषु परवादिसंप्रतिपन्नानि वचनान्येव प्रमाणत्वेनोदाह्रियन्त इति स्थितिः । सदस्यग्रन्थाः प्राधान्येन परवादि-प्रतिबोधनार्थं निर्मिताः । तेषुभयवादिसम्मतानां प्रमाणवचनानामेवोल्लेखो दृश्यते । तत्र परवादिसंप्रतिबोधनार्थं प्रणीतेषु श्रीभाष्यस्तोत्ररत्नभाष्यसच्चरित्ररक्षापाञ्चरात्ररक्षा-दिषु संस्कृतमयेषु सदस्यग्रन्थेषु पूर्वप्रदर्शितरीत्या वराहपुराणवचनानां बहूनां परवादिनः प्रतिप्रमाणत्वेनोदाहरणात्तेषां परवादिसंप्रतिपन्नसिद्धेर्वराहपुराणस्य तथा-

विधवचनशतवृत्तस्य श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायपूर्वाचार्यैः प्रणीतत्वं परिवर्धितत्वं वा न शक्यशङ्कम् । तथात्वे हि परवादिमतिबोधनप्रधानेषु ग्रन्थेषु परवादिविप्रतिपन्ना-  
नामेषां वचनानां प्रमाणत्वेनोदाहरणं न युज्यते । किं च श्रीवराहपुराणे श्रीरामा-  
नुजसंप्रदायानादितानामपि बहूनामर्थानां वर्णनदर्शनात् अवसीयते इदं पुराणं  
श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिपूर्वाचार्यैर्न प्रणीतं परिवर्धितं वेति । यदि तेऽस्य ग्रन्थस्य  
प्रणेतरः परिवर्धयितारो वा स्युः, तर्हि स्वसंप्रदायामन्यामर्थान् नोपनिबध्नीन् ।  
दृश्यते च बहूनां रामानुजसंप्रदायामन्यामर्थानामुपनिबन्धः । तथाहि—

(१) श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदाये विष्णोः सर्वेश्वरत्वं ब्रह्मरुद्रयोरनीश्वरत्वं चाम्युप-  
गम्यते इति प्रथितम् । अत्र—

“स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयेशितृत्वं नारायण त्वयि न मृष्यति वैदिकः ।  
ब्रह्मा शिवः शतमखः परमस्वराडित्येतेऽपि यस्य महिमार्णवविप्रुषस्ते” ॥  
इत्यादयः स्तोत्ररत्नश्लोकाः प्रमाणम् । श्रीवाराहेऽष्टपञ्चाशेऽध्याये—

“सस्त्रीकं च हरिं पूज्य रुद्रं वात्रोमया सह ।

या श्रीः सा गिरिजा प्रोक्ता यो हरिः स त्रिलोचनः ॥ ३ ॥

एवं सर्वेषु शास्त्रेषु पुराणेषु च गद्यते ।

एतस्मादन्यथा यस्तु ब्रूते शास्त्रं पृथक्कृतया ॥ ४ ॥

रुद्रो जनानां मर्त्यानां कान्यं शास्त्रं न तद्ववेत् ।

विष्णुं रुद्रकृतं ब्रूयात् श्रीगौरीति निगद्यते ।

एतयोरन्तरं यच्च सोऽधमेत्युच्यते बुधैः” ॥ ६ ॥

इति सप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

“यो विष्णुः स स्वयं ब्रह्मा यो ब्रह्मासौ महेश्वरः ।

वेदत्रये च यज्ञेऽस्मिन् पण्डितेष्वेष निश्चयः ॥ २६ ॥

यो भेदं कुरुतेऽस्माकं त्रयाणां द्विजसत्तम ।

स पापकारी दुष्टात्मा दुर्गतिं समवाप्नुयात् ॥ २७ ॥

मां विष्णोर्व्यतिरिक्तं ये ब्रह्माणं च द्विजोत्तम ।

भजन्ते पापकर्मणस्ते यान्ति नरकं नराः” ॥ ४० ॥

इति, एकसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

“प्रणम्य शिरसा देवं यावत्पश्यामि हे नृप ।  
तावत् तस्यैव रुद्रस्य देहस्थं कमलासनम् ॥ २ ॥  
नारायणं च हृदये त्रसरेणुप्रमाणकम् ।  
ज्वलद्भास्करवर्णमिं पश्यामि भवदेहतः” ॥ ३ ॥ इति  
यज्ञेऽस्मिन् यद्भुतं हव्यं मामुद्दिश्य महर्षयः ।  
ते त्रयोऽपि वयं भागं गृह्णीमः कविसत्तमाः ॥ ६ ॥  
नास्माकं विविधो भावो वर्तते मुनिसत्तमाः ।  
सम्यग्दृशः प्रपश्यन्ति विपरीतेष्वनेकशः” ॥ ७ ॥ इति,

द्विसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—

“विष्णुरेव परं ब्रह्म त्रिभेदमिह पठ्यते ।  
वेदसिद्धान्तमार्गेषु तन्न जानन्ति मोहिताः ॥ ४ ॥  
अहं विष्णुस्तथा वेदा ब्रह्मकर्मणि चाप्युत ।  
एतत् त्रयं त्वेकमेव न पृथग्भावयेत् सुधीः ॥ १४ ॥  
योऽन्यथा भावयेदेतत् पक्षपातेन सुव्रत ।  
स याति नरकं घोरं तेनैवं पापपूरुषः” ॥ १४ ॥ इति,

त्रयःसप्ततितमेऽध्याये—“विष्णुरुवाच

वरं वरय भद्रोऽस्तु देवदेव उमापते ।  
न भेदश्चावयोर्देव एकावावासुभाववि” ॥ इति,

सप्ताशीत्यधिकशततमेऽध्याये—

“एकमूर्तिस्त्रिधा जातो ब्रह्मविष्णुहरात्मकः ॥ १२ ॥  
क्रोधहेतोर्मया सृष्ट ईश्वरोऽसुरनाशनः ।  
मम नाभ्यामभवत्पद्मं पद्मगर्भः पितामहः ॥ १३ ॥  
एवं वयं त्रिधा देवाः कृत्वा लोकार्णवाः महीम् ।  
तिष्ठामः सरमप्रीत्या मायां कृत्वा तु वैष्णवीम्” ॥ १४ ॥

इत्येभिर्वचनै रामानुजसंप्रदायासमतं त्रिमूर्त्यैक्यं त्रिमूर्तिसाम्यं वा प्रतिपाद्यते ।  
किं च, स्तोत्ररत्नभाष्ये “कस्योदरे” इति श्लोकव्याख्यानने वारुहे एकसप्ततितमेऽ-  
ध्याये विष्णुवाक्ये “त्रिधा लक्षणं स भगवान् सत्सर्व-सरमेश्वरः” इत्यादीनि वचना-

न्युद्धृत्य “त्रिधाऽऽत्मानम्” इत्येतत् स्वेन रूपेण क्षेत्रज्ञद्वयविशिष्टरूपेण चेति बहुप्रमाणानुसारेण मन्तव्यम्” इति क्लिष्टगत्या योजनेन निस्वीयते यत् श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायानुसृतः “एकं त्रेधा विभक्तम्” इति तत्त्वमुक्ताकलापे निरसनीयपक्षेऽन्यतमत्वेन परिगणितः पक्ष एवात्र स्वरसतः प्रतिपाद्यत इति ॥

(२) शरणागतेन दीक्षितेन वैष्णवेन वर्णाश्रमधर्मा यावज्जीवं कैङ्कर्यात्मिनऽनुष्ठेया इति रामानुजसिद्धान्तस्य विरुद्धो दोषितस्य शरणागतस्य वर्णाश्रमधर्मत्यागस्य प्रतिपादकानि वचनानि वराहपुराणेऽष्टविंशत्यधिकशततमेऽध्याये मन्त्रः—त्यक्तानि विष्णो शस्त्राणि त्यक्तं सर्वं क्षत्रियकर्म सर्वं त्यक्त्वा देवं विष्णुं प्रपद्येऽथ संसाराद्वै जन्मनां तारयस्व” ॥७॥ “मन्त्रः—अहं वैश्वो भवन्तनुपागतः प्रमुच्य कर्माणि च वैश्ययोगम् । दीक्षा च लब्धा भगवत्प्रसादात्पसीदतां मे भवन्मम मोक्षणम्” ॥१७॥ इति । मन्त्रः—

शूद्रोऽहं शूद्रकर्माणि मुक्त्वा भक्ष्यं च सर्वशः ।

भक्ष्याभक्ष्यं ततस्त्यक्त्वा त्यक्त्वा च शूद्रकर्म च” ॥२६॥

इत्येवंरूपेणोपलभ्यन्ते ॥ एषां धर्मस्वरूपत्यागे एव स्वात्म्यम् । धर्मस्वरूपत्यागो रामानुजसंप्रदायविप्रतीपः ।

(३) रामानुजसंप्रदाये सकामकर्माणि मुमुक्षुनिष्कलप्रदत्ताविशेषान् “न सुकृतं न दुष्कृतम्, सर्वे पाप्मानोऽतो निर्वर्तन्ते” इति श्रुत्यनुगोचरं नै- निवेद्य त्याज्यत्वेन निर्णीतानि । परंतु वराहपुराणे अष्टादशाध्यायादारभ्य चतुविंशाध्यायान्तोऽध्यायाद्येषु नवतितमादध्यायादारभ्य द्वादशाधिकशततमाध्यायान्तेषु अध्यायेषु अन्यत्र च सकामकर्माणि कर्तव्यत्वेनानुशिष्यन्ते । अयं मौनैकान्तधर्मप्रतिपादनतत्परस्य श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायस्यासम्मतोऽर्थः । इत्थं कतिपयानां श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायविरुद्धानामर्थानां श्रीवराहपुराणे वर्णनदर्शनान् विप्रतिपन्नान् परवादिनः प्रति श्रीवराहपुराणवचनानां श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायग्रन्थेषु प्रमाणत्वेनोपादानात् उभयवासिसंप्रतिपन्नानामेव वचनानां प्रमाणत्वेनोदाहरणीयत्वाच्च यद्यप्येवं श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायसंमतानां बहूनामर्थानां वर्णनस्य वराहपुराणे दर्शनेषां पुष्पं न रामानुजसंप्रदायानुयायिभिः प्राचीनैर्विद्वद्भिर्निर्मितं परिवर्धितं चेति, किन्तु श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायाविर्भावाद् बहोः कालत्प्रागेवेदं पुराणं वेदव्यसादिभिर्निर्मितं चेति च



# TELUGU VERSIONS OF THE PURĀṆAS

By

K. V. RAMAKOTI SASTRY

[ 'पुराण' पत्रिकायाः द्वितीये भागे २२५-२४२ पृष्ठेषु डॉ० 'वे० राघवन्' महोदयेन तामिलपुराणानामुपपुराणानां च सविस्तरं वर्णनं प्रस्तुतम् । तामेव सरणिमनुसृत्य वर्तमानलेखस्य लेखकमहोदयेनात्र तेलुगुपुराणवाङ्मयस्य मुद्रितस्यामुद्रितस्य च परिचयः प्रस्तुतः । तेलुगु-साहित्ये संस्कृतपुराणवाङ्मयस्य प्रभावः स्पष्टं लक्ष्यते । त्रयोदशीं शताब्दी-मारभ्य वर्तमानकालं यावत् तेलुगुभाषायां संस्कृतपुराणानामुपपुराणानां च गद्य-पद्यमिश्रिता बहवः स्वतन्त्रा अनुवादा रचिताः । केषुचिदनुवादेषु च मूलसंस्कृतपुराणानां अध्यायानां श्लोकानां चोल्लेखा अपि प्राप्यन्ते । संस्कृतेऽप्रसिद्धानि कानिचिदुपपुराणान्यपि तेलुगुभाषायां प्राप्यन्ते, तेषामप्यत्र वर्णनं प्रदत्तम् । सर्वेष्वेव तेलुगुपुराणेषु महर्षिः कृष्णद्वैपायनो व्यास सर्वेषामेव पुराणानां कर्ता मन्यते । ]

The Purāṇic literature of our country is an eternal treasure, enriching our culture and ennobling our national character from times immemorial. Our Indian culture withstood the hostile onslaughts of several currents throughout the ages. To day we find the noble features of our heritage passed on firm and intact with all the necessary vitality from the ancients. As an important component of national literature, the influence and impact of the purāṇas on Telugu literature needs no special emphasis. It struck deep roots in the life of the Telugu-speaking people.

Purāṇas had their heyday when in good olden days native princes and their subordinates patronised the poets and scholars who with zeal and devotion rendered Purāṇas into Telugu. The people evinced keen interest and great regard which led to the promotion and flourishing of the Purāṇic Literature in Telugu for the last so many centuries. NANNAYA, the first and the foremost of our Telugu poets of the 11th

century, referred to himself as a well-versed scholar in all the Purāṇas. He further referred to the court of his patron king Rajaraja as it was studied with a good number of Purāṇic Scholars i.e. Paurāṇikas. His testimony bears ample evidence to the fact that the Purāṇas had a great reputation and influence and had their pride of place in this land, It is significant to find that even the present-day scholars and poets carry on with their ever-growing literary activity of rendering the Sanskrit originals into Telugu, and thus add to the wealth of our literature. This Purāṇic consciousness indeed bridges our past, present and future and thus contributes to the enrichment of our culture.

The mass appeal of the Purāṇas was due to the impressive presentation with necessary explanation by the specialised scholars on the public platforms. This was the media of propagating the ethical values of the Purāṇas throughout this country. Even today we find such practice, especially on religious occasions. There are families completely devoted to this mission; and with the passage of time they came to be known as PURĀṆAM VARU, and their succeeding generations bear the surname PURĀṆAM. Another peculiar point of interest is that some of the families take after the surname of that particular Purāṇa they are associated with, e. g. BHĀGAVATULA, BHĀRATULA etc.

We can safely say that the Purāṇas started appearing in Telugu versions by the end of 13th century. This rendering continued all through and even to this day. A striking paradox in the course of our Telugu literature is that the dawn of the 20th century saw on one hand the rendering of the Purāṇas into Telugu, and on the other had the upheaval of the recent western literary trends.

My endeavour in this paper is to present a detailed chronological order of the Telugu versions of the Purāṇas with the necessary data of the re-renderings. First of all, I would like to give the main characteristics of the Telugu versions as follows:

1. All the Telugu versions contain both prose and verse.
2. A few of them give the number of Adhyāyas and Ślokas of their original Sanskrit texts.
3. All of them unanimously acknowledge the 'Venerable sage of uncommon wisdom' Veda-vyāsa (Kṛishṇa-Dvaipāyana) as the author of their originals.
4. Word to word translation is something foreign to many of the Telugu versions.
5. Generally versification in the Telugu versions speaks of a very easy flow of style and at times easier than the prose passages they contain.
6. There are cases where the authors exhibit a free and flexible handling of the material in their Telugu renderings and at the same time they are faithful to the spirit and meaning, i. e., tātpariyārtha of their originals.

At present some of the Telugu versions of the Purāṇas are not traceable, and some are in the neglected state. This causes concern and compels for a thorough undertaking and vigorous efforts to trace and to bring to light. Especially the Telengana area deserves special attention for a complete and a thorough survey. No doubt it is heartening to find that the present day scholars are doing their best in this connection, but it needs much more research to 'save' the soul of our literature. However, we have ample Purāṇic literature in Telugu on hand to-day.

#### MARKANDEYA-PURĀṆA

A. Among the Purāṇas this is the first<sup>1</sup> that has been translated into Telugu. The name of the poet is MARANA. He belongs to the 14th century A. D. Scholars are of the opinion that this Purāṇa might have been written at about 1320 A. D.<sup>2</sup> Even though this is a translation of the Sanskrit original, there are places where the Telugu poet dealt independently. We do not know why this poet did not touch in the end of his work the stories of NARISHYANTA and DAMANA, the son and brother respectively of the great MARUTE. This Telugu

version which is in eight Āśvasas with 2477 gadya-padyas concludes with the glorified story of MARUTH.

B. NARASIMHA KAVI is another person, whose name we hear as the author of a Telugu version of this Purāṇa.<sup>3</sup>

C. OUBALA KAVI (1540 A. D.) has also rendered Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa<sup>4</sup> into Telugu, the whereabouts of which are not known.

D. Another poet who translated Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa completely is MANDA KĀMEŚVARA KAVI who belongs to the last quarter of the 19th century. It is strange that this Kavi did not even mention at least any one of the above poets. If we compare both the texts of Marana and this Kavi, it will be clear that this Kavi has gone through the text of MARANA. This version ends with the war of DAMANA with VAPU-MANTA the South Indian King. It seems that KĀMEŚVARA KAVI'S translation is more close to the original than that of MARANA.<sup>5</sup>

#### PADMA-PURĀṆA

A. We are told by SRINADHA, a very well established Master poet of the latter half of the 14th century that KAMALA-NABHAMATYA, his grandfather, had written Padmapurāṇa-saṅgraha in Telugu. But that book has not yet come to us.

B. MADIKI ŚINGANA of the 14th century has given a Telugu version of the Padma purāṇa Uttarā Khaṇḍa.<sup>6</sup> There is a stray verse which is not included in the printed text in which the poet said that he has rendered Padmapurāṇa into Telugu, by which one can infer that he has translated the whole of the Padmapurāṇa. But we are aware of the Uttarā Khaṇḍa only.

C. KAMINENI MALLA REDDY'S Telugu version of this is available in print. He belongs to the second half of the 16th century. He did not translate the purāṇa completely. He has concentrated on Siva Rāghavanulapakadha only which forms part of Pātāla Khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa. This work begins with the arrival of Lord Śiva in the guise of a Rishi to

the court of Sri Rāma and extends to be an exposition of the Lord on various subjects to Śri Rāma in five Āśvasas with 1412 gadya-padyas.

D. We are having Paśupati Subbaraja Kavi's Mahāpurāṇa, the Telugu version of Māghamāhātmya which is a part of the uttara-khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa. Subbaraja Kavi has referred to Ramagiri Singana<sup>8</sup> as having rendered a part of Māghamāhātmya. Subbaraja Kavi of this century has published his work in 1924 A. D.

E. Pillalamarri Pinna Veerana who belongs to the 15th century, has translated the Māgha-māhātmya into Telugu. But nothing is available to us.

F. There is one more Telugu version of the Māgha-māhātmya, which forms part of the Padma Purāṇa, by Vedatam Seshacharya of this century. This work, in six Āśvasas and 2307 gadya-padyas, has been published by the author himself in the year 1932 A. D.

G. Rāmāśvamedha, which is a part and parcel of the Pātāla Khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa is said to have been rendered into Telugu by Tripurana Venkata Surya Prasada Raya Kavi<sup>9</sup> (1889-1945 A.D.)

H. The complete translation of the Padma Purāṇa we are having now is of Paśupati Chidambara Sastry who is known even in the court of Maharaja of Kāśī. This in four volumes is now available in print. Svarga Khaṇḍa is not referred in this Telugu version. And there is no such reference to Svarga Khaṇḍa in Pātāla Khaṇḍa of this Telugu version as shown by Asoka Chatterjee (Purāṇa, Volume No. 2 Page 175-183). Scholars are of the opinion that this Telugu version is very close to the Sanskrit original. This scholar poet Chidambara Sastry passed away on the eleventh day of Dec. 1951.

#### NARASIMHA-PURĀṆA

A. YARRANA (1280-1345 A. D.)<sup>10</sup>, one among the celebrated Kavitrāyam, gave Narasimhapurāṇa also to Telugu people.

But this is neither a translation nor an adaptation. He has taken the story from the Bṛahmāṇḍa and Viṣṇu Purāṇas and developed it into a grand literary piece with his descriptive talent. Veluri Sivarama Sastry who edited this book for Vavilla Ramaswamy Sasturulu and Sons, Madras, has expressed his opinion that this Telugu Purāṇa is quite different from that of Gopala Narayana & Co., Bombay Sanskrit edition of the Narasimha-purāṇa.

B. There is reference<sup>11</sup> to the effect that one Proluganti Chennasauri of the 15th century also has translated this purāṇa into Telugu. But unfortunately this Telugu version is not available.

C. We possess Narasimhapurāṇa Uttarabhāga which belongs to Hari Bhattu of the 15th century. This Telugu version, in five Aśvasas with 1000 gadya-padyas, deals with the later life story of Prahlāda i. e. his war with Viṣṇu and Indra etc.

D. Bārigadpula Dharmayamatya is another poet with whose name there is one Narasimhapurāṇa in manuscript. Dr. B. Rama Raju<sup>12</sup> writing about this poet, placed him in the first quarter of the 18th century. Though the name of this work is Narasimhapurāṇa, actually the text is very peculiar in six cantos. The first ends with the story of Jaya and Vijaya. The second one contains the stories of Nārada-Suparṇa-Amba riṣa-Kārtavyāyārjuna and Paraśurāma etc., The third and fourth cantos deal with Hiraṇyākāśipu, Hiraṇyākṣa and Prahlāda. The fifth one is nothing but an abridged story of Rāmāyaṇa, whereas the sixth deals with the story of Śrīkṛṣṇa.

E. Kotikalapudi Kodanda Rama Kavi's (1807-1883) Telugu version of this purāṇa is available only in manuscript.<sup>13</sup>

#### VIṢṆU-PURĀṆA

A. Paśupati Naganādhā of the 14th century is said to have translated Viṣṇupurāṇa.<sup>14</sup> We have only one verse from that Purāṇa describing VASANTARTU today in the Telugu Academy at Kakinada,

B. There is one translation of this purāṇa belonging to to the 16th century. The name of the author is Vennelakanti Sūrana. It is distinct in the preface of the Telugu version that this work is a translation of Parāśarasamhitā i. e. Viṣṇu-purāṇa a part of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa. This is some what confusing but we can find the same in the original Sanskrit Viṣṇupurāṇa printed in Telugu script by Srikanchi.pra. Annangaracharya (Iti Sarvapurāṇanāmādhībhūte Bīhmāṇḍākhye Mahāpurāṇe Vudhbrutāyām Parāśaraśasamhitāyām Sri Viṣṇu Purāṇe .) Seshadri Ramana Kavulu, the editors of Telugu version are of opinion that Surana did not actually follow the original Sanskrit and even this is not a complete translation of the Viṣṇu-purāṇa. Surana has limited himself to the first part of the purāṇa which is full of stories glorifying Viṣṇu and Śrīkṛṣṇa leaving the second part that describes various Dharmas, Vratas and Philosophy etc., This in eight Āśvasas with 3010 gadya-padyas.

C. Kalidindi Bhāvanārāyaṇa of the 16th century is another poet to translate the Viṣṇupurāṇa into Telugu. This has been edited and published by the University of Madras in the year 1930 A.D. This version contains only four Amśas and 1806 gadya-padyas. It is doubtful whether Bhāvanārāyaṇa has completely rendered the purāṇa including the last two Amśas of the original or not. The editors, late K. Ramakrishnaiah, Reader of the Madras University, and P. Lakshmikantham, the present professor in Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupathi, after comparing the Telugu version with the original, expressed sincerely in their introduction that Bhāvanārāyaṇa has followed the Sanskrit original more closely than any other translator of any other purāṇa. Of course they have clearly stated where the poet introduced his original ideas too though they are negligible in character.

D. Dittakavi Venkatāmātya (17th century) is also said to have given a Telugu rendering of this purāṇa of which the other particulars are not known.

E. Mudumrai Deekshitulu of the 19th century is another poet to translate this Viṣṇupurāṇa.<sup>25</sup>

F. CHAKRAPURI RAGHAVĀCHARI<sup>16</sup> is one more name with which we can find a Telugu Viṣṇupurāṇa. But this not at all a translation of any Sanskrit original. It is an independent work by itself giving information about yamaloka and Rāmānuja's religious and philosophic activities.

G. Two prose versions of this Viṣṇupurāṇa, one by Tupakula Ananta Bhupati<sup>17</sup> of the 18th century and the other one by Nori Gurulinga Sastry, are also in Telugu. The second one has been published in August 1904 A.D.

H. There is one Seetaramasiddanti<sup>18</sup> with whose name we are informed that there is a Telugu version of Viṣṇupurāṇa.

#### SKANDA--PURĀṆA.

Except a reference<sup>19</sup> to one NALLA REDDY (1667-1696 A.D.) as the author of the Telugu Skandapurāṇa by Kundurti Venkatachal Kavi of the 18th century, we know nothing more either of the poet or his purāṇa. So we can say that no poet upto now has translated the whole of the Skanda Purāṇa into Telugu. But there are poets who have given Telugu versions to the many parts of the Purāṇa. They are in nutshell as follows :—

1. GODĀVARĪ KHANḌA :—This Telugu version of this Khanḍa is the work of Srinadha, the most famous among the Telugu poets, belonging to the 14th century. He has re-named it Bhīmeśvarapurāṇa. The reason that he gives to justify his title is that there is nothing but the glorification of the God Dakṣarāma Bhīmeśvara in Godāvarikhanḍa and hence it can be called Bhīmeśvarapurāṇa as well. This work is in six cantos with 1035 gadya-padyas.

2. KĀŚĪ KHANḌA :—This is also the work of the above poet Srinadha in seven cantos and nearly 1750 gadya-padyas. We have one more translation of this Kāsikhanḍa in Telugu prose by Nanja Raju belonging to the latter half of the 18th century. This is a true translation of the original following of the Adhyāya Krama.<sup>20</sup>



3. KEDĀRA KHAṆḌA: - PEDAPATI SOMAIAH<sup>31</sup> (1500 A. D.) is the first man to translate this Khaṇḍa. But his Telugu version is lost. There is another unpublished translation of this Khaṇḍa by Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma<sup>32</sup> of this century.

4. ARUṆĀCHALA KHAṆḌA :—The above-referred Somaiah is said to have rendered this Khaṇḍa also into Telugu as Arunachalapurana.<sup>33</sup>

5. KAUMARIKA KHAṆḌA:—This is the work of the above-mentioned Seshadri Sarma in three Āśvasas with 4847 gadya-padyas. According to the author, the Sanskrit original that he has followed is in 66 adhyāyas.

6. NAGARA KHAṆḌA :—We are having a Telugu version of this by Turaga Rajakavi and Ayyanki Balasarasvati of the 16th century.<sup>34</sup> A recent translation of this in 10 Āśvasas and 8952 gadya-padyas by Janapati Pattabhi Ramasastry (1900) in Telugu is available in 4 volumes having been published in 1923, 25, 28 and 34 respectively.

7. BRAHMOTTARA KHAṆḌA :—Pidupanti Basavana's (1470-1500 A. D.) is the first translation of this khaṇḍa in Telugu in Dwipada metre.<sup>35</sup> Another Telugu version of this Khaṇḍa in five Āśvasas by Linganaradhya is in manuscript.<sup>36</sup> Pochiraju Veeraya Kavi alias Kolakaluri Verrana<sup>37</sup> also has rendered into Telugu Vibhūti Rudrākṣa Māhātmya, a part of the Brahmottarakhaṇḍa. There are three other poets who have rendered this into Telugu. They are Sridharamalla Venkata Rama Kavi, Mutturaju Venkata Krishna Kavi and Pratakota Mallaiiah Kavi,<sup>38</sup> Venkata Rama Kavi's Telugu version is now available in print. He belongs to the 18th century. Pattamatta Soma Nadha Somayaji (1520-1630), a great scholar poet has also translated this Brahmottarakhaṇḍa, into Telugu.

8. ŚIVARAHASYA KHAṆḌA :—The Telugu version of this is the work of Kodoori Venkatachala Kavi belonging to the second half of the 17th century. This Telugu version is complete in seven khaṇḍas namely, Sambhava, Asura, Veera-mahāndra, Yuddha, Deva, Dakṣa and Upadeśa and has been published. Another Telugu version of this in Dwipada metre by

Oubalakavi can be found in manuscript.<sup>29</sup> Venkayalapati Veerbhadra Kavi<sup>30</sup> and Revuri Anantayaja (18th century)<sup>31</sup> are referred to be the authors of the Telugu versions of this Khaṇḍa. One Mulugu Ayyavarlu<sup>32</sup> is also said to have rendered this khaṇḍa into Telugu.

9. DHARMA KHAṆḌA :—We have only one Telugu version of this by Edulapalle Bhavanisa Kavi of the 18th century. This, in nine Āśvasas with 3165 gadya-padyas, deals mainly with the life story of Vālmīki.

10. SREESALLA KHAṆḌA :—Seshanaradhya (1500 A. D.) rendered this into Telugu in six cantos and named it Sri Parvata Purāṇa. This has been published in 1938 A. D. by Padurti Akkyyadevara of Madras. Another poet who translated this into Telugu is Attaluri Papakavi of the 18th century. This is in manuscript.<sup>33</sup>

11. SETU KHAṆḌA :—Papayamatya's Telugu version of this Khaṇḍa is in manuscript.<sup>34</sup> One more version in five cantos by Damera Venkata Raya Kavi also can be seen in manuscript.<sup>35</sup>

12. MAHEŚVARA KHAṆḌA :—We have a prose translation of this which includes Kedāra, Kaumārika and Aruṇāchala Khaṇḍas by Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu of this age. This has been published as Āndhraskhaṇḍa first part in the year 1959.

13. PRABHĀSA KHAṆḌA :—The Telugu version of this belongs to Chaganti Bhakaralinga Sastry of these times. It is learnt that he has neither completed nor published it.

14. SŪTA SAMHITĀ :—Pattamatta Somanadha Somayaj who has been referred to above in this paper, is the author of the Telugu version of this Samhitā. He has translated this even without leaving 'Tu and Cha', to quote his own words, following Tātparyā-dīpikā the commentary of Vidyāraṇya, in seven Āśvasas with approximately 2000 gadya-padyas. It is supposed that this version might have come out in 1578 A. D.

15. ŚĀNKARA SAMHITĀ :—There are two Telugu versions of this Samhitā in manuscript<sup>36</sup> both of which are very

much worn out and are of unknown authorship. Sivaramalinga Kavi<sup>97</sup> in the year 1733 A.D. translated this in three Āśvasas and named it Vīra Śaivācāra Sangraha. Two other writers Nanja Raja<sup>98</sup> of the 18th century and Mallamapalle Buchikavi (19th century ?) whose date is not exactly known, have rendered Halasyamāhātmya which forms part of this Śaṅkara Saṁhitā into Telugu. Nanja Raja's version is in prose whereas Buchikavi's is in Campū in six Āśvasas and 3458 gadyapadyas. This Halasyamāhātmya has again been translated by Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma in six Āśvasas with 2296 gadyapadyas. The Two Telugu versions of Buchi Kavi and Seshadri Sarma are available in print, being published in 1943 and 1906. There is one Skandapurāṇetiḥasamāñjarī, a prose translation in Telugu. The name of the author, as the catalogue says, is Nori Gurlinga Sastry. One more prose version of Sivarahasya Khaṇḍa (Sambhava Khaṇḍa) in Telugu is the work of Mudigonda Veeresalinga Sastry. This has been published with the original in Telugu script in 1926 A.D.

Here I would like to draw the attention of the learned scholars to some of the important points that concern the Skanda Purāṇa basing on the Telugu versions mentioned above. Srinadha the first Telugu poet to place his hand on the Skanda purāṇa, has described in his Bhimeśvarapurāṇa, as it is fulfilling the five lakṣaṇas and having sapādalakshagrandhas. Again he refers to it in his Kāśī Khaṇḍa as having six Saṁhitās, i.e. Sanatkumāra-Sūta-Śaṅkara-Vaiṣṇava-Brahma and Saiva and Pañcaśatakhaṇḍas like Pañcha Nagara, Kamalālaya, Revā, Ekavīra, Mailara, Godāvari Khaṇḍas etc. According to his reading the saṁhitās contain pañcaśatsahasrika, Śatasahasrika, Trimsatsahasrika, Pañcasahasrika, Trisahasrika and Ekasahasrika respectively. He further points out that some are of the opinion that Kāśīkhaṇḍa is Vedavyāsa Sūtasamvādātmakam. Srinadha's reading of the slokas of the saṁhitās is quite similar to that of the number given in the Sanskrit original. According to Pattamatta Somanadha Somayāji Śivamāhātmya, Jñānayoga, Mukti, and Yajñavaibhava Khaṇḍas form Sūta Saṁhitā. Nanja Raja has referred Śaṅkara Saṁhitā as Agastyasaṁhitā.

Halāsyamāhātmya gives us an explanation that because Agastya is the person that narrated the Śaṅkara Saṁhitā it is called Agastyasamhita also. Buchi Kavi further says that there are 50 khaṇḍas altogether in the six saṁhitās of the Skanda purāṇa. Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu speaks of this Purāṇa as there are two versions in Sanskrit, one with saṁhitās and the other with Khaṇḍas and upakhaṇḍas. And again he refers to the second version as having seven main khaṇḍas, Maheśvara etc.

The seven khaṇḍas of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā (Tamil Kanda Purana) as Dr. V. Raghavan gives, are one and the same in order too, in Śivarahasya Khaṇḍa as has been given by the Telugu poet Venkatachala-kavi with a slight change regarding the first and the third. The Telugu poet gives sambhava in the place of Utpatti and adds Veera to Mahendra which makes no difference at all. The point to be noted here is whether Śaṅkara Saṁhitā and Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa are one with two names, or are they separate books? As Dr. Raghavan admits, the Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa forms part of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā. Then how is it possible that the whole of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā to have seven khaṇḍas only that makes Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa?

If Śivarahasya Khaṇḍa is a part of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā, then what about the other parts of it? Because the Tamil translation of the Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa, as Dr. Raghavan puts it, is in two khaṇḍas we have to request him to give the names of those two khaṇḍas which will solve the problem. According to the Telugu poet Venkatachala-kavi, there are Twelve khaṇḍas in Śaṅkara Saṁhitā of which the Śivarahasya khaṇḍa is the first having seven khaṇḍas in itself. This is all because to say that the Tamil Kanda purana must be a translation of Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa only and that it cannot be of the Śaṅkara Saṁhitā as a whole as has been opined by Dr. V. Raghavan.\* Another point to be noted is in the original text of Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa printed in Telugu script we are told of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā as

\*Tamil versions of the purāṇas by Dr. V. Raghavan, (Purana Vol. II No. 1 and 2, pages 225-245).

having two parts and the first in seven khaṇḍas with 10,000 ślokas is known as Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa. Again we are supplied with foot notes "Vistareṇa Suvistrutā" for "Dvibhāgaissayutacatat" and "Tatgrandhai Trayodasa Sāhasraśca" for "Tamgrandhai Dasasāhasrai" (Sambhava Kāṇḍa Dvitiyodhyāya, 60, 61). The Sanskrit original Śivarahasyakhanda is not referring to the twelve khaṇḍas of the Śaṅkara Saṁhitā and the Telugu translation of it by Venkatachal Kavi is giving a different independent version of the Khaṇḍas of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā on one hand, and on the other taking the footnote reading of the ślokas. Some sincere enquiry is needed to be definite of the parts or khaṇḍas of Śaṅkarasaṁhitā and of the Ślokas of Śivarahasya khaṇḍa.

#### NĀRADĪYA—PURĀṆA

Pillamari Pinaveerana of the latter half of the 15th century has mentioned Nāradiya purāṇa<sup>40</sup> as his previous work in Telugu of which the whereabouts are not known. There are two other poets, namely Vasiraju Ramaiah (1500 A.D. ?) and Kottalanka Mrutyunjaya Kavi<sup>41</sup> who are said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu. A complete palm-leaf manuscript of this purāṇa belonging to Allada Narasimha Kavi is available.<sup>42</sup> The above mentioned Mrutyunjaya Kavi's Telugu version in six cantos called Bruhannaradeeya is also available in manuscript.<sup>43</sup>

#### VARĀHA—PURĀṆA

The Telugu version of this Purāṇa in twelve Āśvasas and 1709 gadya-padyas is the work of Nandi Malliah and Ghanta singaiah who belong to the 15th century. This has been edited and published in 1904 A.D. by Kandukuri Veeresalingam Pantulu. Another poet Hari Bhattu who has been referred to above in this paper, also gave a Telugu rendering to the Ādikāṇḍa of this purāṇa. This is available in manuscript.<sup>44</sup>

#### BNĀGAVATA—PURĀṆA

A. The famous Bhakta Kavi Potana (1450-1500 A.D.) is the author of this purāṇa in Telugu. Unfortunately the present

available text is not completely Potana's. 1 to 4, 7th and 10th of the twelve skandhas are from the pen of Potana. The fifth skandha is by Gangaiah, sixth by Singaiah and the last two i.e. 11th and 12th by Veligandala Naraiah. These three poets are said to be Potana's disciples. Any how this Telugu Bhāgavatapurāṇa enjoys a great reputation in this region even today.

B. Madikisingana (14th century) has rendered only the Dasamaskandha of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa which is even now in manuscript.<sup>44</sup>

C. Sixth, eleventh, and twelfth skandhas of this purāṇa have been rendered into Telugu by Hari Bhattu (15th century).<sup>45</sup>

D. A Telugu version of this purāṇa in Dvīpāda metre by Tekumalla Rangasai can be seen in manuscript.<sup>46</sup>

E. Sripada Krishna Moorthy, Sastry, the late poet-laureate of Andhrā Pradesh, has one Telugu Bhāgavatapurāṇa to his credit.

F. Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma, a great scholar poet of this century, seems to have rendered the Dasamaskandha of the purāṇa into Telugu as Tandavakrishna Bhāgavatam.

G. Kokkireni Narasimha Raya Kavi has translated the eleventh Skandha of this purāṇa. The author quotes the original Sanskrit śloka and gives his translation in verse and writes Tātparya and explains it in detail. This peculiar translation has been published in 1914 (Madras).

H. 11th and 12th Skandhas of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa have been recently translated into Telugu by Minnikanti Gurunadha Sarma of Guntur. This true translation with the title Sri Madguru Bhagavatham has been published in 1952. In his introduction to this work Durbha Subrahmanya Sarma, a scholar-poet of Nellore, has referred to two poets who translated this Purāṇa into Telugu, Kovuri Pathabhiramaiah (11th Skandha only) and Srīman Sampamudhumba Singaracharya (1, 2, 5, 10, 11 and 12th Skandhas only) Subrahmanya Sarma is doubtful whether Singaracharya has rendered the remaining Skandha of the Purāṇa or not.

We have a complete true translation of the Bhāgavata purāṇa by Gandham Srirama Murthy and Irrinki Narsimha Murthy who are known as Sri Rama Nrusimha Murthy Kavulu belonging to the present day. This version is published in five volumes in 1955 A. D.

#### MATSYA—PURĀṆA.

A. Haribhattu's Telugu version of this purāṇa is the first of its kind. The late Manvalli Ramakrishna kavi has brought this into light from Gadwal. This has been first published by Oletivenkata Rama Sastry of Pittapuram in his magazine KAVITA. It is believed to be an incomplete translation limiting itself to the Viṣṇudharmottara khaṇḍa.<sup>47</sup>

B. Lingamaganta Ramakavi (1650 AD) is one that is said to have translated this purāṇa.<sup>48</sup>

C. Kanādam Peddana of the 18th century the poet of surapura (Gadwal ?) Samstan has also translated this purāṇa.<sup>49</sup>

D. Manda Kamesvara Kavi is another name that is associated with a Telugu version of this.<sup>50</sup>

#### VĀYU—PURĀṆA.

We hear of only one Oddepadi Peddana (1500 A. D.) as having rendered Māghamāhātmya<sup>51</sup> which is a part of this purāṇa into Telugu.

#### GARUDA—PURĀṆA.

Pingali Surana of the 16th century said that he had translated this purāṇa.<sup>52</sup> But not even a single manuscript of this is to be found.

#### ŚIVADHARMOTTARA

The Telugu composition of this by Raja Malla Reddy of the 16th century is in 8 cantos with 1167 gadya-padyas. This has been published in 1913 A.D.

#### VĀMAṆA—PURĀṆA.

A. Yelakuchi Bala Sarsavathi and Lingamagunta Rama Kavi (1550 A. D.) are said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu.<sup>53</sup>

B. A Telugu version of this purāṇa in ten cantos by Oubalakavi (1540 A.D.) is available in manuscript.<sup>54</sup>

C. The present available Telugu version of this in print is the work of Ramavajhala Kondaiah Sastry of this century. This version is in twelve Skandhas with 4443 gadya-padyas.<sup>55</sup>

#### KŪRMA—PURĀṆA.

A. Rajalingakavi of the 17th century has given a complete translation of this purāṇa in Telugu which is still in manuscript.<sup>56</sup>

B. Manda Kamesvara Kavi of the 19th century,<sup>57</sup> who has been referred to above, is also said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu of which we know nothing more.

#### LĪṄGA—PURĀṆA.

A. Without any concrete evidence, we are being told<sup>58</sup> that there is a Telugu version of this purāṇa by Tenali Ramakrishna Kavi of the 16th century.

B. Of this Līṅga Purāṇa we have a recent translation in Telugu by Mulugu Chandramouli Sastry which has been published in two parts (pūrvārdha and uttarārdha or Bhāga) in 1929. We have a preface in prose by the author himself published in the first part from which we can know something new about the Sanskrit original. According to that there are 109 Adhyāyas in pūrvārdha and 55 Adhyāyas in Uttarārdha.<sup>59</sup> One more important point we have to note, as the author says, is that the editors of the Līṅga Purāṇa Bombay edition have dropped some ślokaś in the uttarārdha which tell us about Śivalīṅga Dīkṣhā, Līṅga Dharma and Līṅga pūjā. Those slokas are from Nandeśvara (Sailadi), Sanatkumara Samvāda. Actually they may have their place just after the exposition of the Guru-Śiṣya Lakṣaṇas i. e. in the Śiva pūjā Krama.

#### KALKI-PURĀṆA

Chilakapati Ramanuj Sarma<sup>60</sup> is said to have given a Telugu version of this purāṇa in 1898 A. D. We have a prose translation of this in Telugu by Puvvada Balakrishna Rao



which is published for second time in 1925 A. D. This Telugu version gives the number of the Adhyāyas of the Sanskrit original as 35, and ślokas as 1600. 'Anubhāgavatam' is the additional title of this purāṇa.

#### BRAHMĀṆDA-PURĀṆA

A. We are furnished with a palm leaf manuscript<sup>61</sup> of the Telugu version of this purāṇa by Kavuri Yallaiah of the 16th century. This version has been described by Chaganti Seshaiiah<sup>62</sup> as having the stories of Paraśurāma, Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa in six Āśvāsas. In the words of the author, his Telugu version of this purāṇa is 'Ardhapanṇakavi jūāna.'

B. Devāṅgapurāṇa<sup>63</sup> in Dwipada metre by Bhadrakavi Lingakavi of the 16th Century is based on the above purāṇa in Sanskrit.

C. Mallupurana<sup>64</sup>, the Telugu version of Mallukulakrama of the above purāṇa, is the work of Nudurupati Venkana belonging to the 18th century.

D. The present Telugu version of the Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa we are having on hand is the work of Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma. This version consists of Prakriyā—Anuṣaṅga—Upodghāta and Upsamhāra padas and 6118 gadya-padyas. The author himself said of his translation that he had left some adjectives here and there and added some wherever he felt necessary. He pointed out further that he had completely the sixty first and sixty second adhyāyas of the upodghātapada which are on gandharva (Music). The reason, as he says, is that those two adhyāyas are beyond his capacity of understanding.

#### BRAHMA-PURĀṆA

The author of this Telugu version is also the above poet Seshadri Sarma. In accordance with the Sanskrit text, this Telugu version is also in 137 adhyāyas (6111 gadya-padyas).

#### ŚIVA-PURĀṆA

This is the last of all the purāṇas to be translated into Telugu. This is the work of Mudigonda Nagaveeresvara Ravi

of this century, and has been published in the year 1947. There are *Sṛiṣṭi*—*Satī*—*Pārvatī*—*Kumāra*—*Yuddha*—*Leelā*—*Līṅga-vaibhava*—*Umā*—*Kailāsa*—*Vāyaviya* and *Vidyēśvara Khaṇḍas* in this Telugu version. The author tells us that the Sanskrit original of this purāṇa is divided into *samhitās* and sub-divided into *khaṇḍas*, but he has dropped the word *samhitā* and used only the word *khaṇḍa*. The parts known as *Śatarudra Samhitā* and *Kotirudra samhitā* in the original are named *Līlakhaṇḍa* and *Līṅgavaibhava khaṇḍa* in this Telugu version. *Vidyēśvara Samhitā* which is found in the beginning of the original has been shifted to the end as *Vidyēśvara khaṇḍa*. The author admits that he has enlarged the *Pārvatī*, *Kumāra* and *Līṅgavaibhava khaṇḍas* and has abridged *Līlā*, *Umā*, *Kailāsa*, *Vāyaviya* and *Vidyēśvara Khaṇḍas* to some extent, while rendering the *Sṛiṣṭi*, *Satī* and *Yuddha khaṇḍas* following the original very closely. Further he makes clear that he has dropped all sorts of repetitions in his Telugu version except the story of *Brahmā's Panchama Śīraḥ Khaṇḍana* which appears both in *Līlakhaṇḍa* and *Līṅgavaibhava Khaṇḍa*. One major change that the author has introduced in his version is, as he says, instead of writing the story of *Upamanyu* for a second time in *Vāyaviya Khaṇḍa* following the original, he has replaced it by inserting the story of *Markaṇḍeya* taking from *Padmapurāṇa*. The author has followed the Bombay edition of the *Śivapurāṇa* for his translation. Any how, if we want to make a comparative study of this Telugu version with the original, now and then we have to search *Skanda*, *Bhāgavata*, *Mahābhārata*, and *Jabāla*, *Kāṭhagiri* and *Upanishats* too as has been suggested by the author in his preface.

We have a Telugu translation of *Jñānasamhitā* only from *Śivapurāṇa* by *Mantri Pregada Bhujanga Raya Kavi* in three *asvasas* and 441 *gadya-padyas*. I am unable to quote the date of its publication as the title page of the copy I have gone through is worn out.

#### DEVĪBHĀGAVATA—PURĀṆA

A. Mulugu Papayaradhya of the 18th century is the

first poet to translate this purāṇa into Telugu. This has been published and widely read.

B. Tripurana Tammaya belonging to the 19th century is referred by his son Venkata Surya Prasada Raya Kavi<sup>55</sup> as the author of the Devībhāgavata purāṇa. Except this much we know nothing of this Telugu version.

C. Dasu Sreerama Kavi (1864-1908) has also translated this purāṇa. It is said that he could finish the whole translation (1100 granthas) in only four (six ?) months<sup>56</sup>. This is available in print.

D. Tirupati, Venkata Kavulu, the epoch makers of this century, have also a Telugu version of the Devībhāgavata to their credit. Though the whole Telugu version goes by their name, but actually some of the skandhas have been written by their disciples. It is stated in the printed text.

E. We are having prose translations too of this purāṇa by S. Visvanadha Sastry and Stanapati Rukminamma of this century.

Janamanchi Venkata Subrahmanya Sarma has also recently translated and published this Devībhāgavata purāṇa.

#### BHĀVIṢYA—PURĀṆA

We have only some prose translations of this purāṇa in Telugu in this century. Brahmaparva of this purāṇa has been published along with the original (216 adhyayas) in 1939 without giving the name of the prose translator by Vavilla Ramaswamny Sastrulu of Madras.

We have one great puranic scholar Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu, who has been referred to above in this paper, by whom we may say that all of the purāṇas have been rendered into Telugu prose. There are of course others too who gave prose renderings of all the purāṇas in this century. Because they were meant for laymen, it is but natural with them to be concise. Astadasapurāṇam by Oleti Venkata Lakshmi Narsimha Sarma may be mentioned in this respect. As

a matter of fact the attempt to give the purāṇas in Telugu prose in this region goes back to Nineteentwenties when the Purāṇa Grantha Mālikā was started under the editorship of Nadakuduti Veeraraju Pantulu at Pitapuram Śiva, Brahma, Vāmana etc., have come out through that Granthamālikā.

#### DATTABHĀGAVATA

The author of this work is Tadepalli Raghavannarayana Sastry of this century. This Bhāgavata glorifies Dattadeva as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu and contains some other stories like Alarka, Kārtavīrya, Kanchanamalini, Paṇasurama, Vena and Nahuṣa etc. in twelve parts known as Guchas with 2865 verse. This has been published in the year 1955.

#### GARGA—SĀMĪHITĀ.

The Telugu version of this Sāmhita, by Chivukuba Appaya Sastry of this century, is named as Gargabhāgavata. This version is having ten Khaṇḍas namely 1. Goloka 2. Brundavana 3. Giriraja 4. Madhurya 5. Madhura 6. Dwaraka 7. Visvajith 8. Balabhadra 9. Vijnana 10. Asvamedha. According to Sivasankar Sastry the pioneer of the modern Telugu, the original Gargasāmhita is with 12,000 ślokas.

#### BHĀRGAVA—PURĀṆA.

We have a Telugu version of this purāṇa which bears an additional title Nityasūricharitra dealing with the surprising stories of Butamuni, Mahamuni etc. in seven Āśvāsas by Kanduri Venkata Dasa kavi (19th century ?) In the year 1922 A. D. this purāṇa has been edited and published by Chelkani. Lacharao of Chitrada. There is one manuscript with the name by Rajabahiri Pamanayaka Bhupal (1751.1773 A. D.)<sup>sr</sup> of Surpura Samstan. This is in eight āśvāsas comprising the stories of Alvars. As the author himself says, the first canto of this Telugu Bhārgavapurāṇa contains the matter of the fifth adhyāya of the uttarakhaṇḍa of the original. Like this the author has taken the necessary subject matter from so many adhyāyas here and there that constitutes the uttar-

khaṇḍa of the Sanskrit Bhārgavapurāṇa. So we cannot consider this version as a complete translation of the original.

#### GAṆEŚA—PURĀṆA

This Telugu purāṇa is the work of Sripada Krishnamurthy Sastry<sup>68</sup> referred to above in this paper. As this is not available now, we can speak nothing more of it.

#### VAIŚYA—PURĀṆA

Bhaskarāchārya (16th century)<sup>69</sup> is the author of this Telugu purāṇa which is in eight Āśvāsas only of which the first four deal with the story of the descending of the Vaiśyas from Kailāsa and the second four with that story of Vāsavikanyā

#### ĀDI—PURĀṆA.

Sarvadeva<sup>70</sup> is said to be the author of this Telugu Purāṇa. The author may be placed at any time before 1500 A.D. We have only two stanzas from this purāṇa in the Telugu Academy at Kakinda.

#### ĀDITYA—PURĀṆA.

This is to be the work of Elakuchi Pinayaditya<sup>71</sup> who is supposed to be in the first quarter of the 17th century.

#### VĀSAVAKANYAKĀ—PURĀṆA

We have a prose version of this Purāṇa in Telugu. This has been published along with the Sanskrit original in Telugu script by Arya Vaisya Yuvajana Sangham of Penugonda in 1951 A. D. According to the original this Purāṇa in 60 Adhyāyas and 3798 śloka is a part of Sanatsujāta Samhitā of Uttara Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa (Iti Sri Skande Uttara Khaṇḍe Sanatsujāta Samhitāyām.....). This Sanatsujāta Samhitā may be another name to Santkumara Samhitā.

#### VIŚVAKARMA—PURĀṆA.

We have a palm-leaf manuscript of this Telugu purāṇa by one Venkatacharyudu.<sup>72</sup> There is another paper manuscript<sup>73</sup> of unknown authorship which goes by the Viśvabrahmapurāṇa.

Besides all this, there are still some more texts in Telugu which pass under the name of purāṇa—Manuvamśapurāṇa, Gauḍapurāṇa, Sagarapurāṇa etc., and Māhātmyagranthas i. e. Sthalapurāṇas based simply on some purāṇic stories enjoying considerable reputation for their literary values, but the premises of my attempt in this paper concerns only the main purāṇas and Upapurāṇas and some of their major sections for which we have Telugu versions of the purāṇas one by one and discuss in detail comparing with their originals which may add something to the purāṇic studies.

#### NOTES

1. If we are furnished with the Narasimhapurāṇa of Vemulavada Bhimakavi (1100–1180 A. D.) that must have been the first Telugu version among the purāṇas.

2. AKT. Volume 3 page 167.

3. ALP. Serial No. 2319.

4. AKT. Volume 9 page 124.

5. We can take for example the Padminividya. This has been rendered in detail completely by Kameshwara Kavi whereas it has been condensed into one stanza by Marana. I have compared this with the originals given by Dr. V. S. Agrawala (Purāṇa Volume 1. No. 2. page 183–197). But one interesting point may be said of Kamesvara Kavi here. His translation of **नजायन्तस्त्रियश्चैव काश्चिद-प्राप्तयैवताः** (VII. 3) corresponds exactly with those of N. N. Dutta and Charuchandra Mukerjee as pointed out by Chintaharan Chakravarti (Purāṇa Volume 3 No. 1 page 44).

6. AKT. Volume 4 page 175.

7. Ramagirisigina and Madikasingana are one only. AKT. Volume 4 page 162.

8. AKT. Volume 6 page 33. As there is one Māghamāhātmya in Vāyupurāṇa also, we cannot without doubt, say, that this Pillamarri Pinaveerana's Māghamāhātmya is from Padmapurāṇa.

9. ARC. page 271.

10. Though Harivaṇsa is called purāṇa now and then, as it is not found in the authentic list of purāṇas, either Yerrana's Harivaṇsa or Nachana Somana's Uttara Harivaṇsa is not mentioned in this paper.

11. NPU. first canto stanza 33.

12. MPM. Page 1–6.

13. ALP. serial No. 1359.

14. AKT. volume 4 page 147. one Vaishnavapurāṇa by Dasakavi by available in manuscript in the Telugu academy, Kakinada.

15. TVS. volume 3 page 1172.

16. AKT. volume 12 page 192–194.

17. SST page 479.

18. IVS. page 11.
19. SST. page 370.
20. SST. page 482.
21. AKT. volume 8, page 226.
22. ARC. page 265.
23. AKT. volume 8, page 226.
24. AKT. volume 11, page 57.
25. VSL. page 103.
26. DCT. No. 197.
27. VSL. page 115.
28. ALP. serial No. 1738. This catalogue reads the author's name as Pullaiah.
29. ALP. serial No. 3281.
30. VSL. page 193.
31. SST. page 379.
32. PKV. page 1.
33. VSL. page 189.
34. ALP. serial No. 2749.
35. TGM. R. No. 543.
36. DCT. No. 357 and 358.
37. VSL. page 155.
38. SST. page 481 and 527.
39. AKT. volume 6, page 33.
40. AKT. volume 8, page 233.
41. ALP. serial No. 1310.
42. TGM. R. No. 86.
43. AKT. volume 8, page 170.
44. DCT. No. 307.
45. AKT. volume 8, page 172.
46. AKT. volume 12, page 75.
47. AKT. volume 3, page 176.
48. AKT. volume 9, page 175.
49. KKS. page 235.
50. TVS. page 1197.
51. AKT. volume 9 page 63. Andhramaghapurānam by Ramadasapradhāni is in manuscript in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
52. AKT. volume 10 page 97. We have one more manuscript of this Telugu purāna by Varadarāja kavi in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
53. AKT. volume 9 page 175.
54. ALP. page 265.
55. This Telugu version is not divided into two parts, and the author has not given any hint to infer that the original as having purvottarabhāgas according to the description given in the Nāradya purāna, chapter 105 (Purāṇa volume IV No. 1 page 187). The original sanskrit followed by author is the edition of Venkateswara Press, Bombay.
56. ALP. serial No. 635, 636, 637,

57. TVS. volume 3 page 1172.
58. AKT. volume 8 page 26.
59. According to Dr. V. S. Agrawala and Dr. V. Raghavan the parvārdha of this Liṅgapurāṇa contains only 108 adhyayas (Purāṇa volume I No. 2 page 236 and volume II No. 1 and 2 page 229).
60. PSL. page 24.
61. ALP. serial No. 1732.
62. AKT. volume 9 page 240.
63. VSL. page 199-201. A manuscript of Devaṅga Charitra (No. 931) of unknown authorship is in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
64. SST. page 430.
65. NKS. first canto, stanza 7.
66. ARC. page 91 and 196.
67. MPM. page 89-93.
68. ARC. page 214.
69. AKT. volume 9, page 206.
70. AKT. volume 9, page 123.
71. AKT. volume 12, page 110.
72. ALP. serial No. 2919.
73. ALP. serial No. 2923.

#### ABBREVIATIONS USED.

- AKT. Andhra Kavi Tarangini by Chaganti Seshaiiah.  
 ALP. An Alphabetical Index of Telugu Manuscripts in the Govt. :  
 Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras 1932 edition.  
 ARC. Andhra Rachaitalu by M. Satyanarayana Sastry.  
 NPV. Narsimhapurana-Uttarabhaga by Hari Bhattu.  
 MPM. Marugunapadina Manikyalu. By Dr. B. Ramaraju.  
 TVS. Telugu Vijayana Sarvasvam.  
 SST. The Southern School in Telugu Literature. By N. Venkata Rao  
 (Second edition).  
 IVS. Introduction to Vishupurana (1939) of Surana by Seshadri  
 Ramana Kavulu.  
 VSL. Veerasaiva Literature. By S. Ramakrishna Sastry.  
 DGT. A descriptive catalogue of the Telugu Manuscripts in the  
 Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji's Saraswati Mahal Library (Andhra  
 University publication 1933).  
 PKV. Peetika in Kumarvijayam by Mudigonda Veeresalinga Sastry  
 (published in 1950).  
 TCM. A Triennial Catalogue of Manuscripts (part 3 Telugu. Govt. :  
 Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.  
 NKS. Kakateeyasaṁchika edited by Dr. M. Rama Rao.  
 PSL. Purana Samalochana of the Telugu Vamana-Purana by Janu-  
 manchi Venkata Subrahmanya Sarma.  
 NKS. Nirvachana Kumara Sambhavam.



## पुराणसूक्तयः

सत्सङ्गः परमो ब्रह्मन् लभ्येताकृतात्मनाम् ।

यदि लभ्येत विज्ञेयं पुण्यं जन्मान्तरार्जितम् ॥

( नारदीय पु०, वेंकटे०, १।४।३५ )

रविर्हि रश्मिजालेन दिवा हन्ति बहिस्तमः ।

सन्तः सूक्तिमरीच्योघैश्चान्तर्ध्वान्तं हि सर्वदा ॥ ( १।४।३७ )

दुर्लभाः पुरुषा लोके भगवद्भक्तिलालसाः ।

तेषां सङ्गो भवेद्यस्य तस्य शान्तिर्हि शाश्वती ॥ ( १।४।३८ )

सम्पद्भिः संयुता वापि विपद्भिश्चापि सज्जनाः ।

सर्वथाऽन्यं न बाधन्ते स्वप्नेऽपि सुरसत्तमाः ॥ ( १।४।३९ )

नास्ति शान्तिसमो बन्धुर्नास्ति सत्यात्परं तपः ।

नास्ति मोक्षात्परो लाभो नास्ति गङ्गासमा नदी ॥ ( १।४।६० )

यौवनं धनसंपत्तिः प्रभुत्वमविवेकिता ।

एकैकमप्यनर्थाय किमु यत्र क्षतुष्टयम् ॥ ( १।७।१९ )

असूयाविष्टे मनसि यदि सम्पत् प्रवर्तते ।

तुषामि वायुसंयोगमिव जानीहि सुव्रत ॥ ( १।७।१७ )

तावत्पुत्राश्च पौत्राश्च धनधान्यगृहादयः ।

यावदोक्षेत लक्ष्मीशः कृपापाङ्गेन नारद ॥ ( १।७।२५ )

विवेकं हन्त्यहंकारस्त्वविवेकात्तु जीविनाम् ।

आपदः सम्भवन्त्येवेत्यहंकारं त्यजेत्ततः ॥ ( १।७।३० )

नास्त्यकीर्तिसमो मृत्युर्नास्ति क्रोधसमो रिपुः ।

नास्ति निन्दासमं पापं नास्ति मोहसमासवः\* ॥ ( १।७।४१ )

पण्डिते वापि मूर्खे वा दरिद्रे वा श्रियान्विते ।

दुर्वृत्ते वा सुवृत्ते वा मृत्योः सर्वत्र तुल्यता ॥ ( १।७।५६ )

\* मोहसमासवः = मोहसम [ः] आसवः ( मद्यम् ) । अपाणिनीयः द्विःसंधिः  
(Double Sandhi) छन्दोमङ्गलनिरासाय ।

## A SHORTER EDITION OF THE MATSYA PURĀṆA TEXT

B. DR. V. RAGHAVAN

[ ३ ] राखणमहोदयः सम्पाद्यमानस्य मत्स्यपुराणस्य  
प्रथमोऽध्यायोऽत्र भावार्थरूपेण प्रकाशयते ।  
राखणमहोदयाय पाठभेदेनेत्यादि च संवादितानां मत्स्यपुराणकोशानां  
अनुक्रमकथाया न ये भवेताः प्रमुक्तास्तेष्वपि प्रारम्भे व्याख्याताः ।  
मत्स्यपुराणस्य विवरणं तु "पुराणम्" पत्रिकायाः प्रथमभागस्य प्रथमेऽङ्के  
अनुरक्तम् । एते च मत्स्यपुराण-आधिक्य-कथाविज्ञान्यसाहित्य कोशानां  
अनुक्रमकथाया निरीक्षणं, अनुक्रमेण तेषां क्रमश्च व्यवस्थापितः । ]

### Abbreviations used

... and the ...

34. **आनन्दश्रमः** = *Arāṇa* of the *Mat-sya* Purāṇa

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

134. 下等 " " " "

274. 4. 1945                      11                      11                      11                      11

$P_A = 478$       "      34      19      13

२१.६. - शब्दकोश विम कोश

(४) - मद्रिद, १५०॥॥

## 3: Manuscripts.

ସା. - (ପ୍ରାୟ) MS., Utkal University, Cuttack.

It. = Nivāṭī (निवारी) Ms., No. 41/182 of Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍārā Library, Fort Ramnagar (Varanasi).

u. J. Jayaram (जनयारम) MS., No. K 6749 of India office Library, London.

MS. No. 4481 of Scindhia Oriental  
Library, Ujjain.

Dr. vanavagar (D. देवनागरी), MS., No. 4646 of Scindhia  
Oriental Institute, Ujjain

\* 2 = D. MS., No. 4146 of University Library, Bombay.

MS., No. 124 of Chammilal Gandhi Vidya Bhavana,  
Surat.

It is D. MS., No. 108 of British Museum, London.

2. 2 = D. MS., No. E. 3549 of IO Library, London.

\*  $\epsilon =$  D. MS., No. 226 of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

to - D. MS., No. 28 of 1871-72, New No. 2, BORI, Poona.

३३ = D. MS., No. 119 of 1884-87, New No. 9 of BORI,  
Poona.

- दे ६ = D. MS., No. E 3548 of IO Library, London  
 दे १० = D. MS., No. 340, New No. 35 of BORI, Poona  
 दे ११ = D. MS., No. 1306 of University Library, Bombay.  
 दे १२ = D. MS., No. 38/182 of Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍāra, Fort  
 Ramnagar.  
 दे १३ = D. MS., No. 2288 of Deccan College Post-Graduate  
 and Research Institute, Poona  
 दे १४ = D. MS., No. E 3550 of IO Library, London  
 दे १५ = D. MS., No. 10443 of New Des. Cat., Sarasvatī  
 Mahal Library, Tanjore.  
 दे १६ = D. MS., No. 10442 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे १७ = D. MS., No. 10440 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे १८ = D. MS., No. 10445 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे १९ = D. MS., No. D. 2254 of Govt. Oriental Manuscripts  
 Library, Madras.  
 दे २० = D. MS., No. 10441 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे २१ = D. MS., No. 10444 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे २२ = D. MS., No. 10446 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे २३ = D. MS., No. 10447 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे २४ = D. MS., No. 10449 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 दे २५ = D. MS., No. 10448 of New Des. Cat., S.M.L., Tanjore  
 ग्र १ = Grantha (ग्रन्थ) MS., No. 402 of Palace Library Tri-  
 vandrum.

[N.B. These abbreviations for the above-mentioned MSS. are those given by Sri A.S. Gupta in his article 'The Manuscripts of the Matsya Purāṇa collated for its projected Critical Edition', published in '*Purāṇa*' Vol. I (1959) pp. 101-111. For the detailed description of these MSS. see the article.\*]

The additional MSS. referred to, not noticed in Sri Gupta's article, are given below :—

- दे २६ = Devanāgarī MS. of Oriental Research Institute,  
 Mysore  
 ग्र २ = Grantha MS., No. 2166 of O. R. I., Mysore  
 तेल १ = Telugu (तेलुगु) MS., No. 1791 " "  
 तेल २ = Telugu MS., No., 369 " "

\* In the article, referred to, these manuscripts have been arranged and grouped according to their similarity and mutual alliance. The abbreviations are given for Roman letters; e.g. D for Devanāgarī, G for Grantha, M for Malayālam, N for Nēvārī, O for Oriyā and Ś for Śāradā manuscript. —A.S.G.

॥ श्रीमद्भैषज्यनमहर्षिप्रणीतम्  
मत्स्यपुराणम् ॥

॥ अथ प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥

\* वाचस्पत्युपनिषोर्मकरवस्तयो यस्य पुच्छामि<sup>१</sup>धाताद्  
 वाचस्पत्युपनिषोर्मकरवस्तयो यस्य पुच्छामि<sup>१</sup>धाताद्  
 वाचस्पत्युपनिषोर्मकरवस्तयो यस्य पुच्छामि<sup>१</sup>धाताद्

सकलवस्तुमतीमण्डलं<sup>6</sup> व्यश्नुवन्नः<sup>7</sup>  
 नृणां भवति नृणां<sup>8</sup> व्यश्निरपहृताद्<sup>9</sup> अश्रियं<sup>10</sup> वः श्रुतीनाम्<sup>12</sup> ॥

नारायणं नमस्कृत्य नरं चैव नरोत्तमम् ।

३५॥ सगन्धतां चैव<sup>१३</sup> ततो जय<sup>१४</sup>मुदीरयेत् ॥

न तो द्वयं यः । "क्रियायोगान्नारायण इति स्मृतः ।

त्रिमृणाय त्रिवेदाय<sup>१७</sup> नमस्तस्मै स्वयंभुवे ॥

मुनमेकाग्रमासीनं नैमिषारण्यवासिनः ।

मृगतो दीर्घसत्रान्ते<sup>19)</sup> पप्रच्छुः<sup>20)</sup> दिव्यसंहिताम्<sup>21)</sup> ॥

प्रचण्डेयव्याघ्रप्रक्षिप्तो द्दिग्गजाः । भवन्तु विघ्नमञ्जय  
अथवा भवन्तां भुजाः ॥ ३॥ ते. ता. येन. चरणाम्बुजाः । विविकाकरा विप्रोक्षरि-  
त्तानये । हृन्. शिरोषशात्मे ] अयमधिकः श्लोकः आ., वे., पुस्तकयोः, मुव., मुक.  
पुनर्वयोः दशमाध्यायसु च दृश्यते । म. प्रचण्डेयस्य स्थानेऽत्र दृश्यते एषः श्लोकः—  
गर्वागर्वादिताता हरितवुर्यो वर्णधूम्रगोलपाणि क्षमा नोदेहदन्ता-रजनिक-  
रिपेर्देहान्भनोरयाया । आग्नेयतां वरोऽसौ हरितनयमुहत्सर्वभूताधियासे हंसो  
यः पानु युग्मभवत्तलद्वयः पङ्कजावासवत्ताः ॥ मुते. प्रचण्डेयस्य स्थाने  
'युजाद्वयवर्म' इति प्रसिद्धः श्लोकः, पातालादित्यस्य स्थाने 'यस्याज्ञया जम्बवत्तल  
शिरोऽङ्गः पानको हरिः । मंहता कालरुद्राख्यो नमस्तस्मै पिनाकिने ॥'  
इति आशङ्क्य दृश्यते । यस्याज्ञयतिश्लोकस्य पूर्ववर्माणं अ२. दृश्यते । एष  
आरः भा. मुहुर्यमायपुराणप्राप्त्ये च दृश्यते । पातालादित्यस्य श्लोकः द्वे ३-५;  
५, ६६-२५; म. २; न. १; मुते. नास्ति ।

१. दे१-२-१८; २६; शा. "वधात्वात् । २ दे१३; "विहृत । दे१; शा. "ममकृत् ।  
 ३. "न-रथ । म. "करणप्र । " दे१. "पराव । शा. "पराद्धाः । ४ दे१. "सोष्य ।  
 ५. "भाज्यात् । " दे१; म१; म; शा. "तारः । ६ दे१६-१७. सकलसुमतिखन्मङ्गल ।  
 ७. "दे१; २६ "मङ्गल । " दे१; शा. "व्यावधानः । ओ. "व्याप्तु" । म. "व्यास्तु" ।  
 ८. "मानसः । " म१. "द्वीररितावा । म. "द्वीररितान । ९ म१. "जुगिति । म. "ज्वमिति ।  
 १० म१. "राहनात् । म. "रपयताय । ११ ओ. "अप्रियं । १२ म१; म. "क्षुलानात् ।  
 १३ दे१; ७; ६; शा. "व्यासं । १४ म१; म. "अन्य । १५ म. "यत् । १६ म१. "त्वक्तः ।  
 १७ दे१; शा. "निवर्गा । ओ. "आदिदेवा । १८ म२; मुते. "कान्तं । १९ म. "अनुक्तम् ।  
 २० मुक्त; मुक्त; मा; वे. "कोष । २१ ते१. "ता ।

प्रवृत्तासु पुराणीषु<sup>1</sup> घन्यासु ललितासु च<sup>2</sup> ।  
 कथासु शौनकाद्यास्तम्<sup>3</sup> अभिनन्द्य<sup>4</sup> मुहुर्मुहः ॥  
 कथितानि पुराणानि यान्यस्माकं त्वयानव ।  
 तान्येवामृतकल्पानि श्रोतुमिच्छामहे<sup>5</sup> पुनः ॥  
 कथं ससर्ज भगवान् \*लोकनाथश्चराचरम्<sup>6</sup> ।  
 कस्माच्च भगवान् विष्णुः मत्स्यरूपत्वम्<sup>7</sup> आश्रितः<sup>8</sup> ॥  
 † भैरवत्वं भवस्यापि पुरारित्वं<sup>9</sup> च गद्यते<sup>10</sup> ।  
<sup>11</sup>कस्य हेतोः कपालिवं जगाम <sup>12</sup>वृषभध्वजः ॥  
 § <sup>13</sup>सर्वमेतत् समाचक्ष्व सूत विस्तरतः<sup>14</sup> क्रमात् ।  
<sup>15</sup>त्वद्वाक्यस्यामृतस्येव<sup>16</sup> न तृप्तिरिह<sup>17</sup> जायते<sup>18</sup> ॥

\* दे २० ; २१ ; ते १ ; मुते. पुस्तकेषु द्वितीयतृतीयपादौ न स्तः । † अत्र अ १. अधिकः श्लोकः दृश्यते—केन वा हेतुना सूत विष्णुः सर्वजगन्मयः । नारसिंहं वपुर्धृत्वा कं वारक्षज्जगत्प्रभुः ॥ एष च अ १. मातृकायां तथा द्रविडानुवादे च विस्तरतः, अन्यासु मातृकासु संप्रहृतश्च दृश्यमानां नारसिंहकथां परामुशति । § अत्र अ १. “कस्माच्च देवदेवेश सच्चिदानन्दलक्षणः । धृत्वा लोके वपुर्दिव्यं कुमार इति विश्रुतः ॥” इत्याधिको दृश्यते । कुमारकथा च अ १ द्रविडानुवादयोः विस्तरेण वर्तते, अन्यत्र सङ्ग्रहेण ।

<sup>1</sup> दे १ ; ३ ; ४-५ ; ७ ; ९ ; १६-२० ; अ १ ; ते १ ; म ; ओ. \*णासु । मुते \*णानां । <sup>2</sup> दे १ ; शा. °च बलासु हि । दे ३. ताय च । <sup>3</sup> दे १७-१८ ; २०. °द्यासु । दे १ ; ३-५ ; ७ ; ९ ; १०-११ ; १६ ; २६ ; ने ; शा ; ओ ; मुक ; मुव ; आ ; वे. °द्यासु । <sup>4</sup> दे ४-५ ; १६ ; १८ ; २० ; म. °वामि । दे ३ ; १६ ; °वामि । ओ. °तामिर्वन्द्य । दे २३ °अभिनन्द्युः । <sup>5</sup> दे ३-५ ; ७ ; १६ : °म ते । दे १६-१८ ; २० ; °मि ते । <sup>6</sup> दे ३. °श्चरेश्वरम् । अ. १ ; म. °चरान् । ओ. °चरः । <sup>7</sup> दे १६-१८ ; १९ °रूपमुपा । मुते: °रूपित्व । <sup>8</sup> दे ४ ; ११-१२ ; १४-१५ ; २६. °मागतः । मुते. °माश्रितम् । <sup>9</sup> दे १. °पुरारि । <sup>10</sup> दे ३-५ ; ७ ; १३ ; १५-२१ ; २६ ; मुते. °निगद्यते । म. °गम्यते । दे १४ ; मुक ; मुव ; आ ; वे. °च केन हि । <sup>11</sup> दे ३-५ ; ७ ; १३ ; १५-१६ ; २६ ; मुते, °कुतो । अ १ ; म. °केन । दे २०-२१ ; अ २ ; ते १ ; मुते. ( पाठान्तरं ) °कथं च लोकपालत्वं । अ १ ; म. °केन । <sup>12</sup> दे ३ ; ७ ; १८-१९ ; मुते, °स वृषध्व । <sup>13</sup> दे २१ ; अ २ ; ते १. °एतत्सर्वं समा । <sup>14</sup> दे १-३ ; ९ ; ११-१३ ; १५ ; २६ ; अ १ ; ने ; शा ; ओ ; मुक ; मुव ; आ ; वे. °रशः । <sup>15</sup> दे १३. °त्वद्वाक्यममृत । अ १ °त्वद्वाक्यामृतपाने तु । आ ; मुक ; मुव. °त्वद्वाक्येनामृत । म. °तद्वाक्य । ते १ °मद्वाक्य । <sup>16</sup> दे २६ °स्येह । दे ३ ; ५ ; १८-१९ ; २६ ; ते १ ; म ; ने ; ओ ; मुते. °स्यैव । <sup>17</sup> दे १६ ; १७ ; शा. °रूप । <sup>18</sup> ओ. विद्यते ।

सूत उवाच—

पुण्यं पवित्रम्<sup>1</sup> आयुष्यमिदानीं शृणुत द्विजाः ।

मात्स्यं पुराणमखिलं यज्जगाद गदाधरः ॥\*

पुरा राजा मनुर्नाम चीर्णवान्<sup>2</sup> विपुलं<sup>3</sup> तपः<sup>4</sup> ।

पुत्रे राज्यं<sup>5</sup> समारोप्य क्षमावान् रविनन्दनः ॥

मलयस्यैकदेशे तु सर्वात्म<sup>6</sup>गुणसंयुतः ।

समदुःखसुखो धीरः<sup>7</sup> प्राप्तवान्<sup>8</sup> योगसुत्तमम् ॥

बभूव<sup>9</sup> वरदश्चास्य वर्षायुत<sup>10</sup> शते गते<sup>11</sup> ।

वरं वृणीष्व प्रोवाच<sup>12</sup> प्रीतः स<sup>13</sup> कमलासनः ॥

एवमुक्तोऽब्रवीद्राजा प्रणम्य स पितामहम् ।

<sup>14</sup>एकमेवाहमिच्छामि त्वत्तो वरमनुत्तमम्<sup>15</sup> ॥

\* अनन्तरं अ १. श्लोकद्वयमधिकं दृश्यते—खण्डद्वयात्मकं तच्च पूर्वोत्तर-विधानतः । उक्तवान् ग्रन्थसङ्ख्यायास्त्रयोदशसहस्रकम् ॥ अध्यायानां शतादूर्ध्वं त्रिसप्तति मुनीश्वराः । तद्वर्णयामि भवतामग्रे धृत्वा यथामति ॥

<sup>1</sup> दे २०-२१, °यशस्यं । <sup>2</sup> ने, °वीर्यवान् । दे २०-२१; ते १; अ २, °चीर्ण-पाणिः परं । <sup>3</sup> दे ३-५; ७; १६-१६, °अखिलं । दे १०; मुते °परमं । <sup>4</sup> दे १७-१८, °परः । <sup>5</sup> ते १ °पुत्रं राज्ये । <sup>6</sup> दे ३-५; ७; १८; म °त्मा । <sup>7</sup> दे १; ३-४, ६-११; १५-२१; अ १ म; ते १; ओ; मुक; मुते; मु व; आ, °वीरः । अ २;—<sup>8</sup>—°दुःखसुखं चैव । <sup>9</sup> ओ °तप्तवान् । <sup>10</sup> दे ३-५; ७; १६-१६; °वचनं । <sup>11</sup> दे २ वर्षाणां च । <sup>12</sup> ने, तं गतम् । <sup>13</sup> अ १; म, °वृणेति हो । दे १ °वृणेषु प्रो । दे २०-२१; मुते, °वृणीष्वेत्युवाच । दे ३-५; ७, °चोवाच । <sup>14</sup> अ १ °प्रीतस्सन् । दे २-७; १३-१६; २१; २६; अ २; ते १ °प्रीतात्मा । <sup>15</sup> म °एवम् । <sup>15</sup> दे २, °वै सुरसत्तमः ।

<sup>1</sup>भूतग्रामस्य सर्वस्य स्थावरस्य चरस्य च<sup>2</sup> ।  
 भवेयं<sup>3</sup> रक्षणायालं<sup>4</sup> प्रलये<sup>5</sup> समुपस्थिते<sup>6</sup> ॥  
 एवमस्त्विति विश्वात्मा<sup>7</sup> तत्रैवान्तरधीयत ।  
 पुष्पवृष्टिः<sup>8</sup> सुमहती स्वात्पपात सुरार्पिता<sup>9</sup> ॥  
 कदाचिदाश्रमे<sup>10</sup> तस्य कुर्वतः पितृतर्पणम् ।  
 यपात<sup>11</sup> पाण्योरुपरि शफरी जलसंयुता<sup>12</sup> ॥  
<sup>13</sup>दृष्ट्वा तच्छफरी<sup>14</sup> रूपं स दयालुः<sup>15</sup> महोपतिः<sup>16</sup> ॥\*  
 रक्षणायाकरोद्यत्<sup>17</sup> स तस्मिन्<sup>18</sup> करकोदरे<sup>19</sup> ॥  
 अहोरात्रेण चैकेन षोडशाङ्गुल<sup>20</sup> विस्तृतः ।  
 सोऽभवन्मत्स्यरूपेण<sup>21</sup> पाहि पाहीति<sup>22</sup> चान्नवीव ॥

\* दे २०-२१. अत्र 'भूत उवाच' इति वर्तते ॥

१ दे १ ; शा. °अस्य मत्स्यस्य । २ दे ५ °चरस्य अचरस्य च । भूतानां च  
 गणस्य च । ३ दे १६-१९ ; प्र १ ; म. °भवता । दे ७ °भवता । ४ शब्द. °णे  
 यात् । दे ७. °णीयोऽहं । दे ३-६ ; १० ; १६-१९ ; ओ. °णीयोऽहं । प्र १. °णीयाय ।  
 ५ ने. °यं । ६ ने. °तं । ७ दे २ ; १४-१५ ; २६. °भूतात्मा । ८ दे १५-२१ ; २६ ;  
 अ २ ; ते १ ; मुते. °च । ९ प्र १ ; मुते. °चिता । १० ने. °मं । ११ प्र २ ; मुते.  
 (पाठात्तरं) °प्रायो । १२ मुते. (पाठान्तरं) °जलसंयुता । दे ५ ; ७ ; १० ; १७-१८.  
 °प्लुता । १३ दे १४. °तं दृष्ट्वा शफरी । १४ प्र १. शफरी । दे २ ; ५ °शफरी ।  
 १५ दे १० °दयालुस्स । प्र २ ; मुते. सद्योऽयं । १६ दे २०-२१. °भुवान्वितः । १७ दे २०-  
 २१ ; ते १ ; प्र २ ; मुते. °मत्स्यं । १८ दे २-३ ; ५७ ; १७-१९ ; म. °स तस्मै ।  
 प्र १ °स तस्य । दे २० ; ते १. °स कस्मिन् । दे ४ ; १४-१५ ; २६. °मत्स्यस्य ।  
 १९ दे ४ ; १४-१५ ; २६. °कलशोदरे । दे २०-२१ मुते. (पाठात्तरं) सरसोदरे ।  
 दे २-३ ; ५-७ ; १६-१७ ; १९ ; मुते °दके । २० दे १७ ; २०-२१. °लि । २१ दे २०-  
 २१ ; ते १. °शरस्थो मनुमुद्रीक्ष्य । प्र १ ; म. °सस्वनं स मनु मत्स्यः । मुते. °को  
 भवान् मनुमुद्रीक्ष्य । प्र २. °—वान् मनुमुद्रीक्ष्य । २२ दे ५-७ ; १६-१८. °पाहि  
 पाहीति ।

स तमादाय मणिके प्राक्षिपद्<sup>1</sup> जलचारिणम् ।

तत्रापि चैक<sup>2</sup>रात्रेण हस्तत्रय<sup>3</sup>मवर्धत<sup>4</sup> ॥

<sup>5</sup>पुनः प्राहार्तनादेन सहस्रकिरणात्मजम्<sup>6</sup> ।

स मत्स्यः पाहि पाहीति<sup>7</sup> त्वामहं शरणं गतः<sup>8</sup> ॥

<sup>9</sup>ततः स कूपे तं मत्स्यं प्राहिणोद्बिन्दनन्दनः ।

यदा न माति<sup>10</sup> तत्रापि<sup>11</sup> कूपे<sup>12</sup> मत्स्यः सरोवरे ॥

क्षिसोऽसौ<sup>13</sup> पृथुतामागात्<sup>14</sup> पुनर्योननसंमिताम्<sup>15</sup> ।

<sup>16</sup>तत्राप्याह पुनर्दानः पाहि<sup>17</sup> पाहि<sup>18</sup> नृपोत्तम<sup>19</sup> ॥

ततः स मनुना क्षिसो गङ्गायामप्य<sup>20</sup>वर्धत<sup>21</sup> ।

<sup>22</sup>यदा तदा समुद्रे तं प्राक्षिपन्मेदिनी<sup>23</sup>पतिः<sup>24</sup> ॥

1 दे२०-२१; ते१; अ२. °प्राहिणोद् । दे६. °प्राक्षिपद् । 2 अ२ °सर्वरा ।  
3 दे२-७; १७-१९; °मात्र । 4 दे२०-२१. °षोडशांगुलविस्तृतः । ते१. °षोडशांगुल-  
मुद्यतः । 5 अ१ °एवमाहा । म. °एवं मां । दे२०-२१. °प्राहार्तनादेन पुनः । अ२  
°तं तु दीन । 6 अ१. °णप्रजम् । 7 दे५-७; १७-१८; २३. °आहि आहीति । 8 दे५-  
६. °गतम् । 9 दे१०; १७. °ततः कूपे स तं । 10 ते१. °ररास । 11 मुते. °वक्रन्द ।  
ते१ °स क्रन्दः । दे१३-१४; २६. °तत्रैव । 12 अ१; म; दे१०; १२; १४-१५;  
२०-२१; २६. °क्रन्वन् । दे३-७; १३; १६-१८; १९; मुते. °तदा । ते१. °क्रीडन् ।  
अ२ °स तं । 13 दे२-४; ६-७; १०; १६-१९; २६; अ१; म °सत्स । ते१;  
अ२; दे२०-२१. °सत्सन् । दे१४-१६; °ततस्स । 14 दे१०. °आयात् । 15 दे१०;  
१३; १५-१६. °तः । दे१; ९; ११; शा. °तम् । दे२ °संमिताम् । दे१२. °विस्तृतः ।  
16 दे१९; °तत्राप्याप्य हि पुनः । दे१६-१८. °वीनं; दे२०-२१. °वीर । अ१; म.  
°वीर । 17 दे. १९. °वीनं । 18 दे ३-७; १६-१८. °आहि आहि । 19 दे१; ११;  
ने; शा; अ०. °मम् । दे३-४; १६-१९ °नृपात्मज । दे२; ७. °नृपात्मजम् ।  
दे२६; मुते. °हीति तं नृपम् । दे२०-२१. । 20 मुते; अ२. °म्य । दे२६ °न्य ।  
21 दे५. °नः । 22 दे२०. °यदा यदा । दे७. ततो यदा । मुते; अ२. यदा तामखिलां तद्वत् ।  
23 अ०. °चावनी । मुते; अ२. °तदानीं प्राक्षिपन् । 24 मुते. °नृप । अ२. °नृपः ।



<sup>1</sup>यदा <sup>2</sup>समुद्रमल्लिलं <sup>3</sup>व्याप्यासौ <sup>4</sup>समुपस्थितः ।  
तदा प्राह<sup>5</sup> मनुर्भीतः<sup>6</sup> कोऽपि<sup>7</sup> त्वमसुरेश्वरः<sup>8</sup> ॥  
अथवा वासुदेवस्त्वमन्य ईदृक्<sup>9</sup> कथं भवेत् ।  
योजनायुतं<sup>10</sup> विंशत्या कस्य तुल्यं भवेद्वपुः<sup>11</sup> ॥  
<sup>12</sup>ज्ञातस्त्वं मत्स्यरूपेण<sup>13</sup> मां<sup>14</sup> खेदयसि केशव ।  
हृषीकेश जगन्नाथ जगद्धामन्<sup>15</sup> नमोऽस्तु ते ॥  
एवमुक्तः<sup>16</sup> स भगवान् मत्स्यरूपी<sup>17</sup> जनार्दनः ।  
साधु साध्विति चोवाच<sup>18</sup> सभ्यग्नं<sup>19</sup> ज्ञातं<sup>20</sup> त्वयानघ ॥  
अचिरेणैव कालेन मेदिनी मेदिनीपते ।  
\*भविष्यति जले ममना सशैलवनकानना ॥

\* प्र १; म. उत्तरार्धं न दृश्यते ।

<sup>1</sup> दे ३-७; १६-२१; ते १. °तदा । <sup>2</sup> दे २. °समुद्रे सलिलं । <sup>3</sup> दे ११. °प्राप्य । <sup>4</sup> दे ३-७; १-१०; १३-१६; २६. °समुपस्थितः । <sup>5</sup> प्र १; म. °प्राह । <sup>6</sup> दे १८. °मनुर्भीतः । ते १ °भीतः । <sup>7</sup> दे २५; ते १. °कोहि । प्र १; मुते; °कोऽपि । मुते. (वाङ्मन्तरं). °रोहि । <sup>8</sup> दे १३-१५; प्र. °ममरेश्वरः । दे २-६; ७; १-११; १६-१६; २५; °मसुरेश्वरः । दे १; शा; °मसुरोत्तमः । <sup>9</sup> दे; शम. °व्यदृक् । मुते; दे १०. °न्यवेदृक् । प्र १; म. °न्यो हीदृक् । <sup>10</sup> दे १ °यत । <sup>11</sup> दे २०-२१. कस्येदं रूपमुत्तमम् । <sup>12</sup> दे १४-१५; १६; २६; मुते; म; प्र २. °जात । ते १ °जातस्य । दे २०-२१. °श्वं तस्य । <sup>13</sup> दे २०-२१; ते १. °स्य । <sup>14</sup> ते १; मुव. °मा । <sup>15</sup> दे २-६; १-१५; १६-१६; प्र १; म; मुते; मुव; मुक; ते १; ने; ओ. °द्धाम । <sup>16</sup> दे १६. °मुक्तः । <sup>17</sup> प्र २. °रूपो । <sup>18</sup> दे २; २०-२१; ते १. °होवाच । <sup>19</sup> मुते. °सभ्यं । <sup>20</sup> ते १. °ज्ञातः । दे १; ५-६; ११-१२; ने; शा; आ; मुक; मुव. °ज्ञातः ।

नोतिरियं मयैवेदनां<sup>1</sup> निकायेन विनिर्मिता ।

मया आचमिकायस्य रक्षणार्थं<sup>2</sup> महीपते ॥

‘मोक्षोऽजोऽद्विजो मे वै जीवा ये च’ जरायुजाः<sup>7</sup> ॥

अस्या निधाय सर्वास्तान्<sup>11</sup> अनाथान्<sup>1</sup> पाहि सुवत ॥

युगान्तवाताभि<sup>14</sup> हता यदा चलति<sup>11</sup> नौर्नृप ।

शृङ्गेऽस्मिन् मग राजेन्द्र तवेमां<sup>12</sup> संयमिष्यसि<sup>13</sup> ॥

<sup>11</sup> ततो लयान्ते सर्वस्य स्थावरस्य चरस्य च ।

प्रजापतिस्त्वं भविता जगतः<sup>15</sup> पृथिवीपते ॥

एवं कृतं<sup>11</sup> युगस्यादौ<sup>17</sup> सर्वज्ञो<sup>11</sup> धृतिमान् ऋषिः<sup>19</sup> ।

‘‘मन्वन्तराधिपश्चापि<sup>1</sup> देवपूज्यो भविष्यसि ॥

इति श्री ‘‘मत्स्यपुराणेऽ २२ मनुमत्स्यसंवादे २१ प्रथमसर्गे २५ मत्स्यरूपदर्शनं नाम प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥

● प्र१; म. अयं जीवाः नास्ति । # दे २१. अत्र अध्यायः समाप्तः ॥ § अत्र आ; वे; मुक. पुस्तकेषु आचिसर्गे इति धर्तते । † इदं दे २०-२१ पुस्तकयोरेव दृश्यते, इतरत्र नास्ति ।

१ दे१५ ‘‘जीवानां । दे१; शा. वेदानां । २ दे६; ११; १२-१५; २१; २६; ने; मुक; मुच; भा. ‘‘महा । ३ दे२ ‘‘धे । शा. ‘‘यं तु । जो. ‘‘यं च मही । ४ दे१; शा. ‘‘स्वेदना कला । दे२ ‘‘स्वेदनाजोऽद्विजा । दे६; १२ ‘‘द्विजा । ५ शा. ‘‘श्चैव । दे३-६; १६ ‘‘जीवा । ६ दे१०; जो. ‘‘येऽपि जीवा । ७ दे२. ‘‘ताः । ८ जो. ‘‘तान् सर्वान् । ९ दे२-३. १२. १४; १६; मुच. ‘‘अनन्तम् । १० दे५. ‘‘लि । ११ दे१; ६-१२; १५; २०; शा; वे. जो. मुक. मुच. भा. ‘‘अनन्तम् । १२ दे१६-१७; ‘‘तदिमां । म. ‘‘तटे मां । १३ वे१ ‘‘संयमिष्यसि । मुच. म. ‘‘मिष्येति त्वं च मान्यथा । १४ दे२. ‘‘अतो । १५ प्र२ ‘‘जगतां । १६ दे३-६; ७; १६-१७; १९. ‘‘कृते । दे२ ‘‘कृत्वा । १७ दे३-७; १६-१७; १६. ‘‘महाराज । दे१, शा. ‘‘युगस्यादौ । १८ दे२ ‘‘सर्वज्ञित्वं । १९ दे११; आ; मुक; मुच; नृप; म. ‘‘वसि । दे१२ ‘‘अमृतमनुजः । २ २० प्र२ ‘‘पुनश्च त्वं विप्रराज्यात् । म. ‘‘पुंसत्त्वं विप्रराज्यात् । २१ दे१ ‘‘वसि । २२ आ; वे; मुक; ‘‘मात्स्ये महापुराणे । २३ आ; वे; मुक; दे१; १०-११; १५; २६; प्र१; २; म; ने. ‘‘मनुविष्णुसंवादे । दे२ ‘‘मनुपितामहमत्स्य-जीवादे । २४ दे३-४; १२; १५-१६; मुच; जो. ‘‘प्रथमे । २५ शा. ‘‘मनुवरजामो नाम ।

## ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

The All India Kashiraj Trust has been carrying on important literary and cultural activities with a view to propagate the ancient sanskrit learning and culture as depicted in the vast encyclopaedic literature of the Purāṇas. The first detailed review of the activities of the Kashiraj Trust and its Purāṇa Department was published in the inaugural issue of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin. Since then we have almost regularly been publishing periodical reviews of the work of the Purāṇa Department and other activities of the Trust. The following is the further review of the activities of the Trust carried out since the publication of the review of its work in the last issue of the 'Purāṇa' (IV. 1., Jan., 1962)

### CRITICAL EDITIONS OF THE PURĀṆAS.

#### 1. *Matsya Purāṇa.*

The critical edition of the Matsya Purāṇa is being prepared at Madras by Dr. V. Raghavan of the Madras University, as has been announced already. The Matsya quotations and readings therein have already been collected from more than fifty Nibandhas. The following Nibandha-works have been further used for this purpose :— (i) Śāstra-nirṇaya, (ii) Āgama-prāmāṇya, (iii) Śūdra-kamalākara, (iv) Vratyatā-prāyaścitta, (v) Vidhāna-mālā, (vi) Parāśara-dharmasamhitā, and (vii) Vidhyukta-Vaivāhikaśāstra-jijñāsā. This completes the collection of the Matsya citations in Nibandhas. The work of collecting Matsya citations, readings therein and the additional Matsya verses found in the *Śabdakalpadrūma* volumes has also been completed. More-over, common matter in Matsya found in all other Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata has also been compared.

The collation of 34 MSS. and collection of readings and allied data being completed, examination of the readings and the editing of the text has now been taken up. A sample edition of the text (Adh. I) has been prepared in the beginning, which is being published in the present issue of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin. Comments and suggestions from scholars will be greatly appreciated.

# सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य

## कार्यविवरणम्

सर्वविद्यासारेषु सर्वशास्त्रमयेषु च पुराणेषु भारतोदयिकानां मन्त्राणां यत्स्वरूपमुपलभ्यते तस्य सम्यक्प्रचाराय काशिराजन्यास-संस्कृतानि सांस्कृतिकानि चानेकानि कार्याणि सम्पाद्यन्ते । एतद्द्वारा कार्येषु प्रथमं सविस्तरं वर्णनं 'पुराण' पत्रिकायाः प्रथमेऽङ्के प्रकाशितम् । नन्वपुनः यत्स्वरूपं न्यासस्य कार्यविवरणं 'पुराण' पत्रिकायां नियतं प्रकाश्यते । एतद्द्वारे १९६२ अङ्क १, जनवरी, १९६२) प्रकाशितस्य कार्यविवरणम् काशिराजन्यासस्य यत्कार्यजातं सम्पादितं तस्य विवरणमत्र प्रस्तूयते ।

## पाठसमीक्षात्मकानि पुराण-संस्करणानि

### (१) मत्स्यपुराणसंस्करणम्

मत्स्यपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकं संस्करणं डा. वे. गवस्वमहोदयमहोदय-नगरे सम्पाद्यते इति तु पूर्वमेव निवेदितम् । मत्स्यपुराणस्योद्धरणानि पञ्चमोऽप्यधिकेभ्यः स्मृतिनिबन्धेभ्यः संगृहीतानि । तदतिरिक्तं च, अन्येऽपि कतिचन निबन्धग्रन्थाः एतदर्थं प्रयुक्ताः । ते च—शास्त्रनिर्णयः, आगमप्रामाण्यम्, शृङ्ग-कमलाकरम्, ज्ञात्यताप्रायश्चित्तम्, विधानमाला, पराशर्यमहोदयः विदुर्गर्वकटिक-शास्त्रजिज्ञासा च । एवं, निबन्धग्रन्थेभ्यो मत्स्यपुराणोद्धरणानां संकलनं समाप्तम् । शब्दकल्पद्रुमादपि मत्स्योद्धरणानि संकलितानि तत्रोपलब्धस्य पाठस्य अति-रिक्तश्लोकाश्च पृथक् संगृहीताः । अपि च, पुराणधर्मेषु उल्लेखानां च समानतया प्राप्तानां मत्स्यपुराणस्य विषयाणां श्लोकानां च तुलनाऽत्र कृता ।

चतुस्त्रिंशतः कोशानां संवादकार्ये पाठादिसम्बन्धिभ्यो इत्यनेन मत्स्य-कार्ये च समाप्तिं गते, अधुना मत्स्यपुराणपाठानां परिष्करणं निर्धारणं च समं भविष्यति । आदौ, मत्स्यपुराणस्य प्रथमाध्यायस्य आदर्शरूपं संस्करणं सम्पन्नं, पञ्चाध्यायस्य प्रथमः प्रकाश्यते । एतस्य संस्करणस्य विषये विदुषां समालोचनार्थम्, मत्स्यस्य पर-श्लाघनीयाः भविष्यन्ति ।

The editorial work comprises not only the restoration of the critical text and the writing down of the readings from all these manuscripts and additional sources, but also the preparation of textual notes, appendices, indexes, several analyses of proper names, subjects etc., besides the critical introduction and apparatus. The editor, Dr. V. Raghavan, hopes that the whole of the editorial work might be finished by 1964.

## 2. *Vāmana Purāṇa*.

The work of preparing its critical edition has been taken up by Dr. V. S. Agrawala of the Banaras Hindu University. Out of the sixteen manuscripts of the *Vāmana Purāṇa*, procured from the various places of India and abroad, eight manuscripts (7 Devanāgarī, 1 Telugu) have already been collated. The MS. of the Bengali Script procured from the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, is now being collated, and will be completed shortly. The description of these *Vāmana Purāṇa* MSS. has been given in the 'Purāṇa', Vol. III, No. 1.

The pāda-Index of the *Vāmana-Purāṇa-śloka*s has been completed, and is now being revised and typed. This index will be utilized for tracing the *Vāmana-purāṇa* quotations from the *Nibandhas*.

## 'PURĀṆA' BULLETIN

The 'Purāṇa' Bulletin of the Kashiraj Trust has been providing an exclusive forum for the Purāṇic studies and research. Indian and foreign Indologists of fame have been contributing their learned articles to this Purāṇic Bulletin. In this issue we are reprinting a learned article on Epic and Purāṇic cosmogony from the *WZKSO* (a well-known Journal of the Indological Institute of Vienna University) by the kind permission of its Editor, Sri Erich Frauwallner, and the Author of the article, Sri Paul Hacker, for both of whom we express our sincere gratitude. This learned article will be found interesting and thoughtful on the textual and cosmogonical aspects of the *Śānti Parvan* and of some of the important *Purāṇas*.

सम्पादनकार्यं न केवलं पाठानां समीक्षापूर्वकमवधारणं पुराणकोशादि-  
सामग्र्योभ्यः पाठभेदानामुद्देशनं चान्तर्भवतः ; अपि तु पाठटिप्पणीनां, परिशिष्टानां,  
विभिन्नमूल्यानां च निर्माणं, वैयक्तिकामिधानानां, विभिन्नविषयाणां च विश्लेषणानि  
तथा अन्यदोषोर्विवर्णं कार्यजातं सर्वं सम्पादनकार्येऽन्तर्भवति । एवं च, समा-  
लोचनात्मिका भूमिका सर्वमन्यत समीक्षोपकरणं च सम्पादनकार्यस्याङ्गभूतमेव ।  
महत्स्यपुराणस्य सम्पूर्णमिदं सम्पादनकार्यं १९६४ ई० पर्यन्तं समाप्तिं यास्यतीति  
आ. धे० राधवनमहोदया मन्यन्ते ।

### (२) वामनपुराणसंस्करणम्

वामनपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकं संस्करणं बनारस-हिन्दू-विश्वविद्यालयस्य  
प्राध्यापकैः अग्रवालोपाध्वैः डा० वासुदेवशरणमहोदयैः सम्पाद्यते । भारतीयेभ्यो  
विदेशीयेभ्यश्च विविधस्थानेभ्य उपलब्धा वामनपुराणस्य षोडश कोशाः । तेषाम्  
अष्टकोशाः ( सप्त देवनागरीकोशाः, एकश्च तेलुगुकोशः ) अद्यावधि संवादितः ।  
पश्चात्तक-सोसाइटी-सकाशाद् उपलब्धस्य बंगालिपिकोशस्यापि संवादः समाप्तप्राप्य  
एव । एतेषां कोशानां विवरणं 'पुराण' पत्रिकायास्तृतीयभागस्य प्रथमेऽङ्के वर्तते ।

वामनपुराणश्लोकानां पादसूच्यपि निर्मिता । तस्याश्चेदानीं संशोधनं  
टंकणं च क्रियते । पादसूचीयं धर्मशास्त्रनिबन्धेषूद्धृतानां वामनपुराणश्लोकानाम्  
अन्वेषणाय प्रयोक्ष्यते ।

### 'पुराण' पत्रिका

काशिराजन्यासस्य 'पुराण' पत्रिका पुराणानाम् अध्ययनाय समनुसंधानाय च  
प्राच्यविद्याविद्भ्यः सम्यग् अवसरं प्रेरणां च प्रददाति । अनेके प्रसिद्धा  
भारतीयौ विदेशीयाश्च प्राच्यविद्याविदो विद्वत्सो गवेषणापूर्णाः स्वनिबन्धा अस्यां  
पत्रिकायां प्रकाशनायान् प्रेषयन्ति । अस्मिन्नङ्के 'आस्ट्रिया' देशीय-  
विद्ययाविश्वविद्यालयस्य भारतीयविद्यासंस्थानस्य WZKSO नाम्न्यां पत्रिकायां  
( पञ्चमे भागे ) प्रकाशितः श्री पॉलहैकरलिखितः शान्तिपर्वणः पुराणानां च भूत-  
सृष्टिप्रक्रियाविषयकोऽतीव विद्वत्पूर्णो निबन्धः तस्याः पत्रिकायाः सम्पादकस्य  
श्री एरिच फ्राउवालनरमहोदयस्य तथा श्री पॉलहैकरमहोदयस्य च समनुग्राहि-  
क्यानुमत्या पुनः प्रकाश्यते । एतदर्थं वयम् उभयोरेव महानुभावयोः परं  
कृतज्ञाः स्मः । गम्भीरनिबन्धोऽयं शान्तिपर्वणः पुराणानां च पाठसमीक्षाविषये  
तेषां सृष्टिप्रक्रियासमीक्षाविषये च परं रोचको विचारोद्बोधकश्च भविष्यति ।

## PURĀṆA PĀṬHA AND PRAVACHANA

According to the scheme of Purāṇa Pāṭha and Pravachana as given in 'Purāṇa' Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 401 f., recitations of the Kālikā Purāṇa, Kūrma Purāṇa and Padma Purāṇa were held respectively in the months of Māgha (Feb.), Phālguna (March), and Chaitra (April) last, in the morning; and discourses on these Purāṇas were given in the evening.

## VISIT BY DISTINGUISHED PERSONS AND SCHOLARS.

The Supreme Patriarch of Thailand visited Ramnagar on April and met His Highness, the Maharaja of Banaras, Chairman of the Kashiraj Trust. He showed keen interest in the activities of the Trust. He was presented the complete set of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin'. He was also good enough to present to His Highness publications of the Buddhist Association of Thailand. It is hoped that the Trust will be able to establish contact with the cultural institutions of Thailand.

The Governors of Gujarat, Rajasthan, and Uttara Pradesh, and Dr. Kailash Nath Katju were the guests of H. H. the Maharaja of Banaras during their visits to Varanasi. Copies of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin were presented to them. Scholars like Dr. Mulk Raj Anand, Dr. Miss Romilla Thapar of the Kurukshetra University and Dr. Mehta Vasistha of the Govt. College, Ludhiana also met the Chairman and acquainted themselves with the activities of the Trust.

We also offer our congratulations to our distinguished Trustee, Dr. Sampurnanand, on his appointment as the Governor of Rajasthan.





